

MAY 1 4 1945

PERIODICAL ROOM

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW



An American Journal
Devoted to Russia
Past and Present

Spring
1945

Vol. 4, No. 2

Price \$1.00

Contributors to This Issue

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, foreign correspondent in Soviet Russia for the *Christian Science Monitor*, 1922-1933, is the author of well-known works on the Soviet Union, of which the latest is *The Russian Enigma*.

RICHARD LAUTERBACH, associate editor of *Life*, was Moscow correspondent for *Life* and *Time* in 1944; his book, *These Are the Russians*, is to be published this Spring by Harpers.

ALBERT PARRY, author of *Whistler's Father*, 1939, and *Russian Cavalcade*, 1944, has contributed articles in the field of Russian-American relations to scholarly and popular periodicals.

VLADIMIR NABOKOV, novelist and poet, is a contributor to the *Atlantic Monthly*, a brilliant translator of Russian poetry, and author of a critical study, *Nikolai Gogol*, 1944.

W. CHAPIN HUNTINGTON, diplomat and author; formerly commercial attaché of the American Embassy at Petrograd (1916-1918); Chief of the Russian Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; author of *The Homesick Million: Russia Out of Russia*, 1933; at present, editor of the Russian Translation Project of the American Council of Learned Societies.

SOLOMON M. SCHWARZ, Russian economist, is the author of *Management in Russian Industry and Agriculture* (in collaboration with G. Bienstock and A. Yugow), 1944, and of numerous economic studies in Russian, French, and German; at present, is Research Assistant at the New School for Social Research in New York City.

VERA ALEXANDROVA, Russian literary critic, has contributed widely to French, German, and American publications on Russian affairs.

N. S. TIMASHEFF, Associate Professor of Sociology at Fordham University, is the author of *Religion in Soviet Russia, 1917-1942*, 1943, and of numerous articles in scholarly magazines.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Journal Devoted to Russia
Past and Present

Vol. 4

SPRING 1945

No. 2

* * *

Russian Aims in the Far East, <i>William Henry Chamberlin</i>	3
Wartime Russia and the Communist Party, <i>Richard E. Lauterbach</i>	11
Prince Golitsyn: Apostle of the Alleghanies, <i>Albert Parry</i>	18
Three Stanzas from Pushkin's Eugene Onegin (Translations), <i>Vladimir Nabokov</i>	38
The Russian Translation Project of the A.C.L.S., <i>W. Chapin Huntington</i>	40
Economic Reconstruction in the Soviet Union, <i>Solomon M. Schwarz</i>	49
Revival of Liberated Cities in the Soviet Union, <i>Vera Alexandrova</i>	62
The Soviet School Experiment, <i>N. S. Timasheff</i>	72

BOOK REVIEWS

Russia Then and Always, by Nina V. and Fillmore Hyde; The Spirit of Russian Economics, by J. F. Norman; Russian Constitutionalism, by Harry Dorosh, <i>Michael Karpovich</i>	88
Made in the U.S.S.R., by William C. White; Peoples of the U.S.S.R., by Anna Louise Strong; The Land of the Russian People, by Alexander Nazaroff, <i>Dimitri von Mohrenchildt</i>	92
Poland and Russia: The Last Quarter Century by Ann Su Cardwell, <i>Michael T. Florinsky</i>	94
Dela i Lyudi (Events and Men), by Simon Liberman, <i>D. Fedotoff White</i>	96

(Continued on page II)

The Ukraine: A Submerged Nation, by William Henry Chamberlin; Ukrainian Literature, by Clarence Manning, Oliver J. Frederiksen ..	97
Gogol, by Vladimir Nabokov, <i>Vera Sandomirsky</i>	99
Vladimir Solovyev on Godmanhood (With a translation of Solovyev's Lectures on Godmanhood), by Peter P. Zouboff, William H. Dunphy	101

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1944, Katherine and <i>Nikander Strelsky</i>	104
---	-----

INDEX TO VOLUMES 3 AND 4

Page 120

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

William Henry Chamberlin

Editor

Michael Karpovich

Associate Editor

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt

Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

James Donald Adams

Stephen Duggan

H. H. Fisher

Waclaw Lednicki

Clarence Manning

Alexander Nazaroff

George R. Noyes

Bernard Pares

Peter Pertzoff

Michael Rostovtzeff

Nikander Strelsky

Alexander Tarsaidzé

Lucy E. Textor

Countess A. Tolstoy

Edmund Wilson

Alexis Wieren

Nicholas Wreden

The aim of "The Russian Review" is to present a non-partisan interpretation of Russian history, civilization, and culture. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article in this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

All dates pertaining to Russia prior to the introduction of the new style (Gregorian Calendar) on February 1, 1918, are according to the old style. The emblem on the cover of "The Russian Review" is an original design by M. V. Dobujinsky, representing "Alkonost," a mythical figure, half-woman, half-bird, popular in Russian folklore.

Copyright 1945, and published semi-annually in November and April, by "The Russian Review," 215 West 23rd Street, New York 11, N. Y. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year in the United States; Canada \$2.20; foreign \$2.50; single copy \$1.00. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without the permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

Russian Aims in the Far East

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

As the European war enters what may well be a climactic phase, there is increased interest in Soviet policies and aims in the Far East. The selection of April 25 as the date for the next United Nations conference at San Francisco unloosed a spate of speculation about the possibility of deliberate timing, with an eye to Soviet participation in the Pacific war.

For April 25 is the day after the last date when the Soviet-Japanese pact of neutrality may be denounced.¹ This pact was concluded in Moscow on April 13 and ratified on April 24, 1941. Its duration is a period of five years, with a further provision that it will be renewed automatically for another five years unless it is denounced by one of the participants a year before its termination.

By the terms of this pact the Soviet Union and Japan are to maintain peaceful and friendly relations and to respect each other's integrity and territorial inviolability. An accompanying declaration extends this obligation, on Russia's part, to Manchoukuo, on Japan's to Outer Mongolia.

The time has long passed when Japan would have been likely to denounce the pact. During the first sixteen months of the Soviet-German War, Japan might well have attacked Siberia, pact or no pact, had it not been for growing pre-occupations in the Pacific. Since the winter of 1942-43, the tide of war, both in Europe and in the Far East, has been flowing steadily against the Axis. Japan's only hope now can be that the Soviet Union will remain aloof. Foreign Minister Mamoru Shigemitsu assured the Japanese Diet late in January that relations between Japan and the Soviet Union were being "securely maintained, in accordance with the neutrality pact."

Japanese nervousness on this question was reflected in a commentary of Domei, the official news agency, to the effect that Anglo-American diplomacy would seek to create a Russo-Japanese rift as the date for the legal denunciation of the pact approached. The initiative in denouncing the pact clearly rests with the Soviet government.

¹Since this was written the Soviet government has denounced the pact [Ed.]

The Crimea Conference shed no clear light on Soviet intentions. The word Japan is not mentioned in the military or political commüniqués. However, the choice of the date for the San Francisco Conference inspired some optimistic guessing that Russia would soon denounce the pact, or even go to war with Japan.

It should be noted that denunciation of the pact, while it would reflect a mood of distinctly unfriendly neutrality on Russia's part toward Japan, would not necessarily mean war. The pact would remain in legal force until April, 1946. And the Soviet Union had remained at peace with Japan for almost two decades before the pact was signed.

On the other hand, a failure of the Soviet government to denounce the pact, while it would cause disappointment in the United States, would afford little guaranty of security to an intelligent Japanese. Stalin's pacts of non-aggression and neutrality with Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia played no visible rôle in shaping his policy in Eastern Europe.

What is likely to determine Soviet participation or non-participation in the Far Eastern war, after Germany has been defeated, is Stalin's conception of the requirements of Russian national interest. The time and method of Soviet intervention will depend on the course of hostilities in the Pacific theatre. A successful American landing in the Japanese home islands would be more important in stimulating action on Stalin's part than the expiration or nonexpiration of a paper pact.

The writer called attention to the influence of prewar Russian expansionism in shaping Stalin's policy in Europe in the last issue of *The Russian Review*. Military and political developments in the intervening period have confirmed this analysis. No less than ten formerly independent European states, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, are at the present time under partial or complete Soviet military occupation. And Soviet military occupation is never without important political consequences.

Because the Soviet Union up to the time of writing (April 1) has been at peace with Japan, Soviet aspirations in Asia have not been outlined as clearly as Soviet ambitions in Europe. But there is no reason to suppose that Stalin is less interested

in Russia's Asiatic neighboring territories, in Manchuria, Korea, Sinkiang, Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey, than in the political dispositions along Russia's European frontier. A brief survey of Russia's prewar policies in the Orient may throw some light on Stalin's future intentions.

Important elements in Russia's Far Eastern policies before the Revolution were the slow overland colonization of Siberia, the urge to acquire warm-water outlets on the Pacific, and the infiltration of Russian influence, sometimes by peaceful, sometimes by forceful means, in such borderlands of the Chinese Empire as Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, and Sinkiang. It is worth remembering that Tsarist Russia, sometimes in combination with Japan, was consistently hostile to large scale American and British penetration of those regions of Northern China which were within the Russian geographical orbit.

The Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 turned back the movement of Russian expansion in the Far East. It sealed the fate of Korea, which was soon afterwards formally annexed by Japan. Russia also yielded its former position of political and economic predominance in South Manchuria to Japan. The latter country took over Dairen and Port Arthur and the railway as far north as Changchun (the later Hsinking).

The Bolshevik Revolution at first brought about an eclipse of Russia's former status as one of the major powers in the Far East. There was international intervention, with a predominance of Japanese forces, in Eastern Siberia. An international commission took over the management of the Russian-owned Chinese Eastern Railway. It seemed that the fruits of decades of political maneuvering and economic development had been lost.

But this eclipse was not permanent. Interventionist attempts melted away as the Soviet government emerged victorious from the civil war. The Japanese evacuated Vladivostok in November, 1922, and handed back Northern Sakhalin, which they had occupied for several years, as part of the agreement for the restoration of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in January, 1925. The Soviet government had already negotiated with China a new scheme of joint Sino-Soviet operation of the Chinese Eastern Railway, on terms somewhat more favorable to China, in 1924.

The Revolution brought two new elements into Russian

policy in the Far East; one of these was an unmistakable asset, the other a double-edged sword. The first was the recognition of China's equal status among the nations, symbolized in the renunciation of extra-territorial rights. The effect on the nationally minded Chinese educated class was very favorable.

The association of the Soviet government with the idea of communism produced more mixed results. Some of the Chinese intellectuals were converted to the new doctrine. Soviet military, economic, and political advisers made a considerable contribution to the early successes of the Chinese nationalist movement. But the social revolutionary trends which were stimulated by the Chinese Communists and some of the Russian advisers produced a crisis and a split in the Chinese nationalist movement in 1927. The more conservative elements, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, retained control of the governmental machinery and the army. Relations between Russia and China were virtually suspended until the common threat of the growing expansion of Japan brought the two countries closer together in the thirties.

Meanwhile Soviet-Japanese relations had developed very smoothly between 1925 and 1931. When the Chinese tried to seize the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1929, Japan gave the Soviet government full moral support in its military action, designed to retrieve the railway, and joined with Russia in rebuffing a circular note which the American Secretary of State, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, directed to signatories of the Kellogg Pact.

The Soviet diplomatic situation in the Orient was sharply modified when Japan took over Manchuria in 1931. The Soviet government found itself confronted with the alternative of ceding control of the Chinese Eastern Railway peacefully or of facing a series of "incidents" which would probably have led to war. The Soviet government was faced with a severe internal economic crisis in the early thirties, in connection with the tremendous strain of the First Five Year Plan. It preferred not to fight, and a sale of the railway to the Japanese puppet state of Manchoukuo at a low price was arranged.

At the same time, the Soviet government made it clear that it would not acquiesce in any Japanese appropriation of Soviet territory. Border defenses were strengthened. A firm attitude was taken when border incidents arose. By concluding a

treaty of mutual defense with Outer Mongolia, the Soviet government gave a clear warning against Japanese invasion of that vast, sparsely populated region, where a Soviet satellite government had been in power since 1921.

Soviet-Japanese relations were chronically strained for a decade, from the Japanese seizure of Manchuria until the conclusion of the neutrality pact between the two countries. Routine border "incidents" developed into prolonged pitched battles on at least two occasions, at Changkufeng in 1938, at Nomonhan, in Outer Mongolia, in 1939. But neither government wished to assume the risks of all-out war.

Since 1941 the border has been tranquil. A Japanese-Soviet agreement in the spring of 1944 provided for the return to Russia, twenty-six years ahead of the stipulated time, of coal and oil concessions which had been granted to Japanese firms in Northern Sakhalin. These concessions had been yielding very little in recent years. At the same time, Japan obtained a five-year prolongation of the right of its nationals to fish in Soviet waters, although on somewhat less favorable conditions than had formerly prevailed.

It would be idle to speculate on the precise nature and timing of possible Soviet action in the Far Eastern War. But, on a broad, long range view, there are four considerations that will be important in shaping Stalin's policy in this part of the world. These considerations may be listed as follows:

1. Stalin no longer has any reason to fear an attack by Japan. It would be little short of madness for a Japan that must brace itself to bear the full brunt of American and British air, naval, and military power after the defeat of Germany to provoke hostilities with the strongest land power on the Asiatic mainland.

Only if the Japanese were convinced beyond any possible doubt that the Soviet Union was planning to strike might they attempt to parry the impending blow by a defensive offensive of their own. This is one of several reasons why any Soviet military intervention is likely to come suddenly and secretly.

It is sometimes suggested that the Soviet government would give the United States the use of air bases in Eastern Siberia. Any such action would certainly presuppose a much higher degree of trust and cordiality than the Soviet régime showed

toward its Western allies during the war against Germany. It was only late in the war, and under severe restrictions, that Americans were permitted to use Soviet bases in order to bomb targets in Eastern Germany. It seems probable that there will be no giving or leasing of bases until Russia is prepared to enter the war. Even then many details of the defense system of Eastern Siberia will most probably be kept secret.

2. Stalin cannot be indifferent to the fate of Manchuria, of Korea, even of Japan proper. This is the strongest reason for anticipating that the Soviet dictator will not sit out the entire course of the Far Eastern war. The last thing Stalin would desire would be the replacement of Japanese by American air and military power in Manchuria. Historically, Russia has always been opposed to strong American and British infiltration in northern and Northeastern China.

As the price of an intervention that is likely to come when Japan is already reeling and tottering under the blows of American air power, that may even be timed to coincide with a successful American landing in the Japanese home islands, Stalin will almost certainly demand a free hand in Manchuria and Korea. He may also want a voice in the disposition of Japan, perhaps a share in the occupation of that country.

3. The Soviet government may be expected to carry on the traditional Russian policy of asserting a paramount interest in the Chinese borderlands which adjoin the Soviet Union. Russia and China possess the longest common land frontier in the world. This fact possesses political, as well as geographical significance.

Manchuria is the richest and most populous of these borderlands. Its population has notably increased and its industries and railways have greatly expanded under the Japanese occupation. Here almost certainly Stalin will settle for nothing short of a "friendly," i.e. subservient local administration. It would be premature to predict the precise political future of Manchuria. Soviet invasion might be followed by what would be described as an irresistible upsurge of popular feeling in favor of the inclusion of the country in the Soviet Union. The Soviet régime has behind it twenty-seven years of rich experience in organizing revolutions and manipulating dependent governments.

It is also quite possible that there may be no outright

Sovietization; that a Chinese regional administration will be established in Hsinking, or Mukden, or whatever city may be chosen as the capital after the expulsion of the Japanese. But this Chinese authority, if the precedent of the treatment of Russia's European neighbors counts for anything, will take orders from Moscow in matters of foreign policy and in a wide range of related subjects.

A nominally independent Korea will also find itself, for obvious political and geographical reasons, under pretty complete Soviet domination, assuming that Japan is reduced to the status of a minor power and confined within its original islands.

There is no reason to expect any change in the status of Outer Mongolia, which, for all essential purposes, has been incorporated in the Soviet Union for more than twenty years. China's shadowy claim to sovereignty in that territory will gradually fade away.

Still farther to the West, in Sinkiang or Chinese Turkestan, one of the most isolated and little known parts of the world, Russian influence was unmistakably strong during the thirties. Soviet military intervention saved a tottering local Chinese administration, threatened by a revolt of native tribes. Non-Russian foreigners were barred from the region. Factories and roads were built with Russian technical aid.

During 1942 and 1943, when Russia's strength was absorbed by the titanic struggle with Germany, there was a reassertion of the active authority of the Chinese central government in this region. Soviet troops, technical advisers, and machinery were withdrawn. The details of this change are wrapped in mystery.

There was a further complication when the official Soviet news agency, in the winter of 1943-44, reported a clash on the frontier of Sinkiang and Outer Mongolia and attributed responsibility to the Chinese authorities. Subsequently, General Sheng Shih-tsai, Governor of Sinkiang for many years, resigned or was dismissed from his post.

The course of high politics in remote Sinkiang is obscure. But it is reasonable to assume that the growth of industry in Soviet Siberia and Central Asia will make for penetration, both political and economic, into the primitive landlocked Chinese borderlands.

4. Soviet-American political and economic contacts will probably be closer in East Asia than anywhere else in the world. In the European power vacuum that will exist after the war, Great Britain is the principal counterpoise to the mighty power and farflung influence of Russia. But in East Asia, America, and Russia, after the elimination of Japan, will be the only two great powers until the coming of the distant and uncertain date when China will attain a degree of military and industrial strength proportionate to its population and size. Any American blueprint for the future of the Far East will scarcely be worth the paper on which it is drawn unless Soviet views and ambitions are carefully taken into account.

Wartime Russia and the Communist Party*

By RICHARD E. LAUTERBACH

THE Soviet Union is emerging from this war changed in many ways. The stresses and strains of the war, the almost mortal blows of the *Wehrmacht* have had a dialectically hardening and softening effect on different aspects of the Soviet system. How many of these changes will continue to develop and be permanent no foreign observer can rightfully say. Many well-informed Russians do not know themselves.

Most of the changes made during the war had their start in prewar years. But the conflict has accelerated them: restrictions on divorce, birth control; new stress on the family as a nucleus of Soviet life; the shift from coeducation to separate education for boys and girls; the trend toward individual home ownership and the building of smaller dwelling units; fostering of Russian nationalism, as well as the indigent nationalism of the less important republics within the Soviet Union; the rekindling of pan-Slavism as a bulwark against future German aggression; the strengthening of the position and function of the Orthodox Church; and the increase both in the membership and the prestige of the Communist Party.

There will be other changes in the Soviet Union. But one thing has not and is not to change: the basis of the Soviet economic system is still the teachings of Marx and Lenin; and Russians, especially the Communists, still believe this system is better than any other.

Foreign observers, writing from the United States, have from time to time discovered a "new capitalism" in the U.S.S.R. The most recent claim of this kind is based on one particular article in a Soviet economic journal and on the tendency of the Russian press to say nice things about capitalism as it exists in England and America.

*This article is a chapter from the author's forthcoming book, *These Are the Russians*, to be published this Spring by Harper. [Ed.]

The economic article which was cited in America was quoted out of context. On the whole it stressed the reaffirmation of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist practices, claiming "socialism is the highest stage of development of society compared to all preceding systems of production" and "the Soviet structure has saved our fatherland."

Soviet leaders are quick to acknowledge the help of capitalist allies in aiding Russia. They find no contradiction between praising Allied aid and Allied production and stating that "the Soviet structure" saved Russia. They have even been careful to differentiate between capitalism as it exists in England and America and as it exists in Nazi Germany. Stalin made this point clear early in the war when he said, "In an attempt to camouflage their reactionary blackguardism, the Hitlerites denounce the domestic Anglo-American regimes as plutocratic. But in England and in the United States there are elementary democratic freedoms and there exist professional labor and employees' unions, labor parties and Parliaments, while in Germany under Hitlerism even these institutions have been suppressed. It suffices to juxtapose these two sets of facts in order to grasp the reactionary essence of the Hitlerite regime and the hypocrisy of the fascist babble about the plutocratic character of the Anglo-American regimes."

Despite this defense of England and America, and despite the fact that the Soviet press has restrained itself from attacking the capitalist "system" as such, there has been no fundamental shift in Russian economic thinking. During the war period they have frankly used every type of production incentive imaginable with one exception; they have not allowed some people to make a profit from the labor of other people.

Although it has been stated and printed often, Americans are still surprised to discover the Russians can own their own homes and everything in them. They can own their own cars, cows, pigs, chickens, and gardens. Furthermore, they can sell such belongings or will them to relatives when they die.

Strictly, private businesses are permitted, too, if an individual handles the entire operation himself. For example, many people make and sell pottery, hats, shoes, jewelry, and handicrafts. But no matter how successful, a private business cannot be "expanded" so that an individual makes a profit on

someone else's labor. The individual proprietor might convince the State to finance a larger enterprise, and in such cases the originator usually remains as director or manager.

There is a growing feeling in Moscow that the value of the socialist system as such in winning Russia's war against Germany must be emphasized. Admittedly, the exigencies of the invasion and the all-out effort to beat the Nazis resulted in a slackening of Marxist study and concomitantly in Marxist internal propaganda. More important things had to be learned—how to survive, how to kill, how to make a hand grenade.

Soviet authorities are perfectly aware of this slackness. The party press has recently been nagging about it. Responsible party functionaries have been reminded that political debates and the self-study of Marxism must be promoted among the workers. One editorial categorically stated that the successful outcome of the war as well as the solution of peacetime problems depended upon the thorough Marxist education of party members and the entire Soviet intelligentsia.

Several times last year Andrei Vyshinsky, First Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, and a member of the Academy of Sciences by virtue of his preeminence as a jurist, lectured in Moscow on the "Soviet State in the Great Patriotic War." Excerpts from this long three-hour analysis appeared in the newspapers and it was later published in booklet form. The central theme was that Soviet successes in the war are traceable directly to the historical correctness of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and, of course, Stalin. In fact the first part of the speech makes special references to Stalin's contributions to Soviet thought. "On the basis of theoretical prerequisites and practical experience," Vyshinsky said, "Comrade Stalin built up laws of socialist construction, struggle, and labor. As an instance I will mention 'The Law of an Offensive,' formulated by Comrade Stalin in 1930 in his reply to 'Comrade Collective Farmers' which reads: 'An offensive without consolidation of captured positions is doomed to failure. An offensive can only be successful in case people are not only advancing but at the same time fortifying themselves in captured positions, regrouping their forces in relation with conditions prevailing at the moment, and bringing in reserves and rear units. This is necessary in order to be protected against surprises, and to close up

breaches in the line which may be caused in every offensive, and thus prepare for a complete rout of the enemy."

The reader will note that although this statement of Stalin's was written in 1930, it is couched completely in military terminology. It is a sharp reminder that the Soviets, since their coming to power, have felt themselves to be constantly waging war in a political and economic sense.

Vyshinsky made other interesting points. He claimed that in the Soviet state there are no contradictions between public and private life, between public interests and private interests. "The basis of the Lenin-Stalin theory about government lies in the welding of persuasion and coercion," he said. I saw how clearly this applied in Central Asia, where the Bolsheviks had successfully introduced scientific agriculture and industrialization by methods which were a combination of "persuasion and coercion."

Reasons for the Soviet victory over the Germans, according to Vyshinsky, were the strength of the Soviet state, the creative energy of the Soviet people; their high moral and political qualities, their devotion and love for their Socialist Fatherland; public Socialist ownership; friendship of the nations (in the U.S.S.R.) and the invincible unity of the workers and peasants; the determining rôle of the Communist Party as the leading force in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Being Americans, we are overprone to look for developments in Russia which indicate that the Soviet Union is becoming more like ourselves. And often the Soviets do nothing to discourage our vanity. Objectively, however, I believe the most significant development in the Soviet Union during the war has been the growth and the strengthening of the Communist Party.

One of the questions for which I wanted to find an answer in the Soviet Union was: did Russia win *in spite* of the Communist Party or *because* of it? It is impossible for anyone but a sentimental romanticist to reach any conclusion but the latter. One has only to view the case histories of Europe's occupied countries, countries where the Communist Party had no tremendous prewar prestige or following. Most foreign and local observers agree that in these areas the Communists were usually the most active, the most cohesive force in continuing the fight against the Nazis. If these factors held in Italy,

France, Yugoslavia, Greece, and elsewhere, they most certainly held in Russia where there are no other parties, where there are no potent organizations which are not either controlled or influenced by the Party.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a well-organized, well-integrated, highly centralized party. When Hitler struck, it was the cement which held all the bricks together in Stalin's fortress. A message tapped at the top of the building was felt in every nook and corner and conversely a frantic plea in the cellar echoed almost immediately to the top. The Party was everywhere, reaching into the depths of the Byelo-Russian forests to organize guerrillas, into Siberian factories to step up the production, onto the collective farms, into the press, the theatre, the radio, the army. What was true to a lesser extent in the smaller countries outside the Soviet Union was true inside it: the Communists had the leadership, the program and above all, the means. When slogans were needed, they had them by the pamphlet-full. When a song was needed to improve morale, they had the songs—and stirring ones, too. When a plant urgently required a high priority building material, the party channel was the quickest way around wartime redtape. The party recruited, trained, propagandized. Every day it spoke to millions in *Pravda*; it spoke through the political advisers in the army and navy; it spoke through the underground, through trained members who remained behind when the Germans moved in; it cemented the fortress.

The Communist Party during the war years has found and developed new, young leadership. Where the new leaders did not come directly from party ranks, they were invited to join. The generals of the Red Army are almost 100 percent party members. In fact, no one is promoted to this rank unless his "political level" is passed upon by Alexander Shcherbakov, chief of the Red Army's political department.

Through the huge army the Party, which was always stronger in urban areas, has recruited millions of peasant youths. Millions more have become Komsomols. Once a party candidate required three witnesses who had been members for eleven years; now one sponsor, who has been a member only one year, can vouch for a recruit. Prewar party membership was 4,250,000; Komsomol membership, about 7,000,000. A responsible government official told me that "party member-

ship may be considered to have almost doubled, Komsomol membership to have more than doubled since the war."

In connection with the current campaign to identify the country's military and production successes with the Soviet form of government and the Communist Party, it should be noted that many of the old Bolsheviks have been awarded high military ranks. Commissars have an honorary rank equivalent to that of a Marshal, and many of them wear impressive uniforms. Nearly all have been awarded war medals and orders.

The new Communists know about flying Airacobras or welding tanks, about farm prices and fertilizer, about writing symphonies and inspirational editorials, about planning reconstruction and running hospital clinics. Their present training contains no more orientation toward world revolution than an American G.I. receives in Officers' Candidate School.

Of course, they do learn to respect the old Bolsheviks and they read their old revolutionary pledges and their old speeches. But the basis of their respect for the old Bolsheviks can best be expressed in the words of Foreign Trade Commissar Mikoyan, who is one himself: "One respects the old Bolsheviks not because they are old but because they never grow any older."

In Soviet schools there have been revisions of some Marxist tenets. But the revisions are in the letter of the word and not in the word. The trend is to regard Marxism not as a fixed and closed body of dogma, but as a dynamic system capable of development and expansion. The rigid, pedantic attitude of the convert to a "faith" is gone in Russian economic theory. "The science of Marx and Lenin does not and cannot stand still. It grows on the foundations of general historical experience. Its various theses and statements change, conforming to new historical situations and conditions," stated the authoritative Soviet magazine *Bolshevik* in a recent issue.

All this does not mean that the Communist Party no longer considers itself a revolutionary force. "We are no longer the revolutionary center of a world revolution," a new party member explained to me. "But we are making revolution by example and we will continue to do so." He gives as an illustration of how this operates in Yugoslavia where Tito's followers were inspired by the example of the Red Army and not by the doctrines of Marx or Engels.

Through the efforts of the Party, Russia has achieved a remarkable degree of social and racial equality and hopes to attain much in economic democracy. Whether or not the Party has become sufficiently strong so that it is willing to foster political self-expression, I do not know. But with such widely divergent groups entering the ranks during the war, one of the results may be a slow liberalizing of inner Party debate and discussion.

Anyone who has seen the Party functioning in wartime Russia cannot hold with the sentimental notion that this is a triumph of "Russia"—vast, rich, overflowing with masses of people—and not *per se* a triumph of the Soviet Union: i.e. the Soviet system. Without its dictatorship, without the Communists (or their counterpart) in the leading rôle, without singleness of thought and purpose, Russia could never have even achieved the truly amazing industrial progress of the two decades between wars.

In the peace that follows there will be no "withering away" of the State. There will be work to do for the dictatorship. Party leaders view the coming decade with its giant task of rehabilitation as a period of crisis as vital to Russia's security and Russia's future as the two Five-Year-Plans. There will be no freedom of speech for those who advocate any change of basic concepts. And there will be no freedom of religion for those who use the church as a weapon against the State or Party.

Prince Golitsyn: Apostle of the Alleghanies

By ALBERT PARRY

A TOWN in Pennsylvania is named after a Russian nobleman. Often told in the Catholic press of this country, the story of Father Gallitzin is seldom touched upon by America's secular writers for the general reader. And yet, Prince Dmitri Dmitrievich Golitsyn, or Father Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin as he was known in his priestly and missionary work, was not only "the Apostle of the Alleghanies." A pioneer of the American frontier, he should not be ignored by lay historians of the westward march of this nation. Psychologists, too, no less than historians, may find material of interest in the unique personality of this convert and builder.

I

Prince Golitsyn was born on December 22, 1770, at The Hague, the second child and only son of Prince Dmitri Alexeevich Golitsyn, who was then the Russian ambassador at the court of the Netherlands. The Golitsyns were a distinguished family, with a military and diplomatic record reaching centuries back. Before going to Holland as Catherine II's envoy, Prince Dmitri Alexeevich had for fourteen years (1754-68) represented Russia at the court of Louis XV in France. During his service and travels he had met and married Countess Amalia von Schmettau, the only daughter of a well-known field marshal of Frederick II.

Countess Amalia's father was a Lutheran, but her mother, née Baroness von Ruffert, was a Catholic. Amalia was educated in a Catholic convent in Breslau but later was taken to Berlin where her finishing school was non-Catholic. She drifted away from the Church as she became intrigued by the Encyclopedists, first through her own contacts and study, and subsequently through her Russian husband.

Prince Dmitri Alexeevich was a deistically inclined member of the Russian Orthodox Church. He not only associated with Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert, and other remarkable minds of the era, but himself wrote and published treatises on mineralogy, electricity, and economics. Yet, despite his scientific bent, he decreed a formal upbringing of his and Amalia's two children in the Russian Orthodox faith. Notwithstanding his enlightened views, he asserted his authority as their father, even though he had been away from his family since the children's infancy.

His son might have early resented the father's absence from the family circle (for which absence, however, as we shall soon see, the responsibility rested on the mother rather than the father). Young Dmitri certainly objected to the sternness of this distant parent. His subsequent revolt against the ideas of his father, and the faith of his nominal fatherland may well have been rooted, in part at least, in this resentment and objection. To be sure, he feared his mother, too, but he loved her in a curious fashion all his own even as he wanted to escape her, and finally did escape. Toward his father, however, his feeling was all dislike, all rebellion; there was nothing ambivalent about that.

Princess Amalia decided to separate from her husband in 1772, when she was twenty-four, and when suddenly, amid all her successes at the European courts, she declared that she was tired of society—that she wanted a life of reading and contemplation. At first, Prince Dmitri Alexeevich would not hear of a separation. Diderot, responding to her plea, was her able advocate. On his way home from Russia, the Frenchman argued with the Prince so well that he let the Princess go, taking the children with her. The parting was amicable.

The Princess moved to a secluded house near The Hague, and there, with her daughter Marianna ("Mimi") and son Dmitri ("Mitri"), she lived quietly until 1779. At first she was wholly absorbed with her own enlightenment, seeking it in books and a few intellectual companionships, but as the children grew, she gave more thought to their education. She wanted a Spartan, rational, yet (vaguely) spiritual method of training for them. A prospectus came her way, telling marvels of a Catholic school system in Westphalia, established by Franz von Fuerstenberg, vicar general of Muenster. The very

thing for Mimi and Dmitri! In the winter of 1779-80 she transplanted her household to Muenster.

From then on, she was much closer to the children, both during their school months in town and summers at the family's country-place of Anglemodde near by. They traveled together. She lectured them incessantly on their real and fancied misdeeds; she made them rise early, wash in ice-cold water, and get along without servants. The father was dutifully kept informed of the children's progress. He sent his advice and instructions, also special brands of delectable Dutch cheese. Princess Amalia reciprocated with Westphalian ham.

When Mitri was eleven, and Mimi twelve, the family's friends and acquaintances were struck by the results of the discipline: the children were sturdy, dressed simply, ran around barefoot (weather permitting), and swam excellently. As for herself, Princess Amalia studied Plato and Socrates, and presided over a small circle of learned neighbors and admirers.

The even tenor of the days and years was disrupted in 1783 when, at the age of thirty-five, Princess Amalia became seriously ill. On recovering, she intensified her search of life's meaning. In 1785 we find her, with Mitri and Mimi and a party of intellectual friends, spending a week in Weimar, meeting Goethe, and discussing problems of man's soul and mind.

Her feverish seeking came to an end in 1786, when she rejoined the Church of her childhood. Early next year—1787—her son, not as yet seventeen, followed his mother's example. On becoming a Catholic, he adopted the additional, baptismal name of Augustine—to honor the 28th of August which was the date of Princess Amalia's birth, marriage, and return to Catholicism.

As a Roman Catholic, Mimi made her first communion and was confirmed together with her brother. Their father, on hearing of his children's step, was furious.

II

In his infancy, as was the custom of the period, Mitri had been commissioned by Catherine II as an Ensign of the Izmailovsky Regiment of the Imperial Guards. There is a

legend that she did this personally, while on a trip abroad, holding the little blue-eyed, flaxen-haired boy on her knees, and caressing him lovingly. Until his removal from The Hague to Muenster, the boy was a playmate of Frederick William, the future King of the Netherlands and Duke of Luxemburg. Mitri's father had every reason to believe that his son would carve out a brilliant career for himself, on the battlefields and at the courts of Europe, in the tradition of his forebears.

In December 1784, on his fourteenth birthday, Mitri received from his family the gift of a sword. But his father was perturbed. A year or two later Prince Dmitri Alexeievich wrote to "My Dear Friend"—to Princess Amalia: "Mitri, I fear, will give us much concern even if he does not bring us blushes and sorrow. Quiet water runs deep. I think you really are mistaken about his actual character; indeed, he always seems to swim against the current." And now, in the late 1780s, came the disquieting, nay, exasperating news of the lad's conversion and deepening mysticism.

The father must have felt relieved when, early in 1792, Prince Dmitri Augustine was appointed aide-de-camp to an Austrian commander, General von Lilien, operating in Brabant against the French revolutionaries. The youth, just turned twenty-one, might have been more than willing to raise his sword as an avenger of the persecutions and humiliations his beloved Church was then suffering in France. But in February 1792 Leopold II died suddenly in Vienna—poisoned, they said; in March, Gustavus III of Sweden was murdered. Both events were attributed to devious intrigues of the Jacobins acting through foreigners, and this led to strict orders barring foreign officers and men from service in the Austrian and Prussian armies. So ended Prince Dmitri's military career in Western Europe before it properly began. His father's relief was short lived.

There was, of course, the son's commission in the Izmailovsky Regiment. The court of St. Petersburg expected him to come to Russia and start his service at once.

Both the son and his mother were aghast. Princess Amalia had but a brief and uneasy memory of her stay in Russia shortly after her wedding. Young Mitri had never visited his father's country and wanted no part of it now. It was a land of schismatics; he wouldn't go there. Princess Amalia said

that if her poor boy had to go to that barbaric end of the world, she would accompany him, to soften his dreadful experience.

Still, not all was lost. Playing for time, praying for the youth's salvation, she asked her husband to secure an extension for Prince Dmitri Augustine. Why not allow the young man his privilege of the grand tour, proper for a son of nobility upon completion of his formal education? Prince Dmitri Alexeevich agreed and obtained a two-year postponement for his strange offspring. He did so impatiently, with some ire; yet he did hope, and at times even believed, that his son would indeed come to Russia and the Izmailovsky on his return from the tour.

Europe was in turmoil. The family plan was, therefore, to send Dmitri Augustine to the West Indies and the United States. A German Jesuit, Father Felix Brosius, was at this time preparing to sail for America as a missionary, and Princess Amalia arranged for him to be her son's companion on the journey across the ocean. The Prince was to travel as a commoner, under an assumed name. The twofold reason was that men of title were not too welcome in the freshly founded republic overseas, and that the use of his true name and rank would make the grand tour rather expensive. And so, Prince Dmitri Dmitrievich Golitsyn set out as Augustine Schmet, the surname being an abbreviation of his mother's maiden name. Later, Schmet was Anglicized to Smith.

The young Russian and his Jesuit friend sailed from Rotterdam for Baltimore on August 18, 1792, (this was possibly the closest sailing date to their favorite August the twenty-eighth that the mother and son could find). Princess Amalia saw her son off. There is a story that at the last moment the youth faltered and clung to his mother, and that in urging him on she inadvertently pushed him off the gangplank into the harbor. Another version tells of his jumping overboard while the shoreline was receding; he swam through the brackish water to the pier and his mother. In either version Princess Amalia persuaded the youth to be a man and go. He calmed down and was rowed back to the halted and waiting ship.

III

The two travelers landed in Baltimore on October 28, 1792.

This was then the Catholic center in the United States, the seat of the See of Baltimore organized as the first see in North America outside Quebec late in 1789, when the Reverend John Carroll, a cousin of Charles Carroll of Declaration of Independence fame, was appointed by the Pope as the first bishop in the States. Prince Golitsyn, among his many letters of introduction, had one to Bishop Carroll.

The two were greatly impressed by each other. The Bishop was pleased by the zeal which his young guest displayed as he spoke of his desire to use his wealth and his education, including a knowledge of some seven languages, in the service of the Church. The Russian was moved by the sight and problems of this brave Catholic outpost in this new Protestant republic. He wanted to help the Bishop; he longed to see the outpost prosper and grow.

The year before the Prince's arrival, a new school had been opened in Baltimore by a group of refugee priests from France. This was St. Mary's Seminary, headed by Father Francis Nagot and other exiles from the Seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris. Its American graduates were to go forth into the cities and the frontier of George Washington's republic—to start Catholic parishes, or to serve the scattered and struggling churches already existing. Prince Golitsyn—or Gallitzin, as by now his name was spelled by those Americans who knew the newcomer's true identity—applied for Bishop Carroll's permission to become a student in the school. The Bishop did not argue much against it, for he sensed the Prince's unswerving determination and rejoiced in it. He was sure the young man would never regret his decision.

Nevertheless, it is said that the American did suggest to the Russian that a higher church office, truly befitting his noble origin and fine education, would eventually await him in Europe. The Prince is supposed to have replied that he could think of nothing higher and nobler than serving the Church in this frontier land, far away from the glitter and luxury of European courts. However sincere this spirit of sacrifice on his part, it is logical for us to presume another reason, too: young Golitsyn wanted to put a long enough distance between

his father and himself, and in a similar way he bore in mind the disapproving Russian government. In the eyes of his father and of the St. Petersburg authorities he was already a renegade; were he now to refuse either to join the Izmailovsky or to enter Catherine II's diplomatic service (an alternative his father suggested), he would be a deserter as well.

And there was his mother. Dmitri Augustine realized that his decision would shock her—that it would be going too far and too fast even for her. But he also knew that in time she would be proud of a priest-son—and that she would want to have him in Europe, not America, to guide him and his career. This he did not want. Frankly, as in later years he was to intimate himself, he meant to stay free of her, now that he had cut loose from her apron strings.

On November 5, 1792, a mere matter of eight days after reaching America, the young man was enrolled in the Sulpician seminary. He was one of but five students in the school (by 1794 their number decreased to two). On December 13, 1792, Bishop Carroll wrote to Princess Amalia about the seminary: "This establishment is well furnished with excellent professors; piety, the greatest of regularity, the love of study and seclusion are its characteristics. . . . Your son . . . surely . . . could not be better placed in order to respond to the views which Providence seems to have for him." She was thus being prepared for the news, soon to follow, that her son was to remain in America forever—as a priest.

When Dmitri Augustine's resolve to take holy orders became known in Germany, there was much commotion and criticism among both the Catholic and Protestant friends and relatives of the Princess. They blamed the Jesuits, and they blamed her, too, for what they considered to be a rash, emotional decision of the youth. Father Brosius, the companion of the long sea-voyage, was a Jesuit; Bishop Carroll's early training was Jesuitic. So there was something in the charge. And though now Princess Amalia was horrified by her son's step, there is no doubt that her conversion in 1786 did start a chain of events, for better or worse, culminating in Dmitri Augustine's decision of 1792. Very shortly, however, she was to proclaim to all her friends and critics that it was for the better. She was proud of her son, through her tears for him.

As for the stern father, it was judged best not to tell him

anything for the time being. The illusion that the young Prince was traveling for his edification was kept up. Occasionally, laying aside his books, the theologian journeyed to Philadelphia or some other adjacent city, duly jotting down in his letters home the more enlightening of his observations, as behooved a young nobleman on a grand tour. The unsuspecting father wrote back to his son that he was pleased.

But the Russian government learned the truth, most likely through its agents in Germany. In January 1794, Prince Dmitri Alexeevich wrote his wife to tell their son of an unexpected order from the authorities in St. Petersburg: the young Prince was to report for duty with the Izmailovsky within six months. The son replied directly to the old Prince, at last openly informing him of the course he had chosen. The father sorrowfully, almost brokenly, wrote back (January 1795) that he could never consent to his son's becoming a priest, but would not stand in his way either. He reminded Dmitri Augustine, however, of the Russian law which deprived of their patrimony those subjects of the Tsarist government who became priests or monks. His daughter Mimi would inherit everything the old Prince owned. The father hinted that she could share this wealth with her brother, provided she kept within the letter of the Russian law. It was typical of the old Prince Dmitri Alexeevich that he communicated all this through the young man's mother. He said he did not know just how he could or should write to his son. He asked Princess Amalia to advise him as to the proper way of telling his son all these views and decisions. The father was hurt; the father was at a loss.

Meantime the studies at St. Mary's were approaching their end. On November 21, 1794, the young student received his minor orders. On March 18, 1795, Demetrius Augustine Golitsyn-Gallitzin-Schmet-Smith was fully ordained by Bishop Carroll. The Russian nobleman was the first Catholic priest to receive all his orders, minor and major, in the United States. He became known as plain Father Augustine Smith.

IV

Declining an offer of a teaching post at St. Mary's, he sallied forth into the wilderness, as an assistant priest at Port Tobacco,

near Lancaster, in eastern Pennsylvania. But there was the first setback: his health, overtaxed by study, could not stand the initial impact of rough frontier life.

Recalled to Baltimore, he lived in the Bishop's own house for more than a year. Because of his Muenster background, he was appointed to preach to the Germans of Baltimore. Feeling strong again, he asked for another frontier assignment, and presently was sent to Conewago near Gettysburg in Pennsylvania, to assist his friend of the sea-voyage, Father Brosius. On horseback and on foot, Father Smith made numerous trips to western and northern Maryland, to the Alleghanies of Pennsylvania, and to such regions hostile to Catholics as the borderlands of Virginia. For a while he lived in Taneytown, Maryland, where there were English-speaking colonists mostly, with whom the young clergyman did not exactly get along. He was hot-tempered in his insistence on his authority. He had little patience with the tendency of these American Catholics to follow the example of their Protestant neighbors as they asserted their democratic right of running their church affairs side by side with, rather than under, their pastor. Bishop Carroll was distressed to hear of the trouble. In October 1798, he wrote to the young priest some sound advice on how to win and keep his flock in this rough-and-ready America.

But the priest had already been looking around for a more congenial parish, preferably one to be established by himself, so as to have his authority unshared and undisputed from the very beginning. He thought he had found such a haven way back in 1795, but years were to pass before his transfer could be effected. His find dated back to a September night in 1795 when he was awakened to go to the bedside of a woman in agony. The journey to a tiny settlement atop the Alleghanies, some 150 miles west of Conewago was long and arduous. Today this area is known as Cambria County of Pennsylvania. The community was founded by the county's first white settler, Captain Michael McGuire, a hunter-trapper and a Revolutionary War soldier, who, beginning in 1788, had brought to these mountains and valleys a number of his fellow Catholics from Maryland, mainly Irish and German.

The sick woman turned out to be a Protestant who wanted to be converted. She embraced Catholicism—and recovered.

This was an auspicious beginning for Father Smith. There was no permanent priest in the hamlet, yet, bequeathed by Captain McGuire, four hundred acres of good land lay ready to support a priest wishing to make this his parish. Father Smith liked the primitive and fertile countryside. If he had any of his Russian parent's talent for mineralogy, he might have noticed the coal outcroppings on these slopes with more than a casual eye.

Deciding to stay, Father Smith bought in October 1795, right next to McGuire's donation, a tract of 320 acres "on the waters of Cheat Creek and Clearfield Creek in Alleghany township, called Hempfield," as his purchase was described in the deed. Learning that he wanted to stay, the priestless settlers were likewise eager for him to do so. Bishop Carroll was accordingly petitioned, and after a considerable delay the Bishop assented.

Father Smith moved his belongings to Clearfield (as the settlement was occasionally called) in July 1799. To the ten or twelve families of the hamlet, some migrants coming with the Russian from Maryland were now added. With the help of these pioneers he built on his tract a log cabin for himself, with a little kitchen and a stable near by; also a small church for the parish. They used white pine for the walls, and they covered the rough bare boards with laurel and hemlock. The miniature church had "a very good shingle roof," as Golitsyn proudly wrote to Bishop Carroll. The women of Clearfield busily moulded candles for the church, which was named after St. Michael the Archangel—to honor Captain McGuire's memory, no doubt, for this was the founder's patron saint. Thus came into being the first Catholic church in what later developed into the rich and powerful dioceses of Pittsburgh, Erie, and, in part, Harrisburg.

The Christmas midnight mass of 1799 opened the church to the handful of the faithful, and Catholic literature tells us the poetry of this first service in tones of hushed awe: the waist-deep snow of the high mountains as the background of the little chapel; the brilliance of the stars above; the silent, profoundly moved settlers, hunters, trappers, Indian traders, and other pioneers of the area; the magnificent voice of the priest-Prince as he intoned the mass.

V

He was to serve in these mountains for forty-one years. In all that time he accepted not a penny of salary. To the contrary, he put into the development of these slopes and valleys nearly \$150,000 of his own, his family's, and his friends' money—a tremendous sum by the standards of the first half of the nineteenth century.

His main purpose was to attract new settlers. To his original three-hundred-acre tract he added other holdings, and all of these lands were divided by him as farms to be bought and cultivated by the German, Swiss, and Irish immigrants slowly, steadily trickling into this wilderness. It is said that, while paying four dollars per acre as his purchase price, he sold this land at one dollar per acre! The colonists could pay him in easy installments. He had a farm of his own, and from its produce he took his own modest living and supported a number of orphans. In time he built a grist-mill, a sawmill, and a tannery. Some coal mining was begun quite early in his headship at Clearfield. The settlement grew, and Golitsyn renamed it Loretto, after a famous shrine in Italy.

To finance his complicated operations, he used the funds his mother sent him, and these were either out of her own income or part of the money she received from the old Prince. At times, in response to her son's urgent pleas, she borrowed sums for his project in the Alleghanies, and she did this gladly even if she did not know (as Mimi wrote to her brother in October 1800) just when or how she would be able to repay such loans.

In 1803 the old Prince Dmitri Alexeevich died. When the news reached the Alleghanies, the priest forsook his bed to sleep on the bare floor of his cabin, a large book serving as his pillow. A woman parishioner was shocked by this discovery, and Golitsyn was angry at her for this intrusion into his privacy. He curtly explained, however, that he was castigating his flesh for the deism and schism of his father. One wonders if he wasn't also trying to atone for his own lifelong sin of opposing his sire so violently, so bitterly.

The old Prince's death threw the family finances into a tangle. Since the son was a priest and, from the official Russian viewpoint, an apostate and a deserter, to boot; and since the

widow and her daughter were such strangers to St. Petersburg and its court, some relatives of the old Prince claimed the possession of his villages, serfs, and other properties in Russia. At any rate, while these claims and counter-suits were being decided by the Tsar's authority, there would be no remittances from the Golitsyn estates near Moscow to bolster Father Smith's colony in Pennsylvania.

And Father Smith needed money constantly, sorely. Many of his colonists were ungrateful wretches who refused to pay for their farms. Others were little else than beggars with a decided aversion for work. Yet others used Loretto and the Russian's charity as a free-aid station on their trek farther West. They did not want to stay and help build up Loretto—and be subject to the orders of this emotional and strict priest.

He was both emotional and strict. Sometimes tears streamed from his eyes as he preached, and he had to stop in the middle of a sermon to control himself. Father Peter Henry Lemcke, his assistant of later years, was fond of him; yet even he testified as to Father Smith's harsh and rash mannerisms, his flaming eyes, his invective that used to frighten adults as well as children. The latter often cried in fright during such anguished sermons. If bolder children snickered or engaged in other unbecoming conduct, Father Smith boxed their ears after the service.

Some settlers resented the straitlace morality which the Russian tried to impose on their drinking habits and other uninhibited ways of the frontier. At the same time the temperance societies of the era drew scant encouragement from him, for he regarded them as tools of the Protestant churches rather than aims in themselves. He thundered that those Catholic priests who took part in this organized temperance movement were unwittingly helping the assorted Protestant faiths to grow. He proclaimed that the Catholic Church was a temperance establishment all its own, and good Catholics needed none other. His beer-imbibing German parishioners and his Irish charges with their devotion to whiskey sided neither with him nor with the priests who aided the new societies.

Both before and after his naturalization as an American citizen, in 1802, Father Smith participated in local and national politics. Not at all in keeping with the time and place,

the princely priest sided with the Federalists of the distant seaboard cities against the back-country Jeffersonians (at first called the Republicans, later becoming the Democrats). In 1808 he was attacked in a letter to a Lancaster editor as a lover of monarchy. To this he replied, also in print, with denials that were not too convincing. The candidate he backed in the election of that year lost out. Father Smith may have been a saintly man but not practical and flexible enough—"not a leader of men in a democratic form of government," as John J. Gorrell, one of his Catholic biographers, candidly acknowledged years later. Had Dmitri Augustine Golitsyn, in his youth, not "developed into a Russian aristocrat," he would have been spared in his American manhood what Gorrell called "many bitter disappointments and sorrows," and "he would have accomplished more in life than was actually his privilege."

Things came to a bad pass when one day a gang of his foes ambushed him near his church and tried to assault him. Breaking away, he ran toward his chapel. He might have been seriously injured or even killed if not for the timely intervention of a faithful trapper who, being a giant of a man, easily dispersed the hostile group.

VI

Though the Russian source of monies was halted, his mother continued to send him funds after 1803. She begged him to come to Europe on a visit. She craved the sight and touch of her son after all those years, but her excuse was that his presence was needed to rescue his father's estate from the greedy reach of his Russian cousins and uncles. After a momentary hesitation, the priest decided against leaving Loretto be it though temporarily. He had too many enemies in the Alleghanies who might take advantage of his absence. And his presence in Germany or Russia wouldn't help this matter of the estate. To the contrary, he was *persona non grata* with the Russian government.

In April 1806 Princess Amalia died. Her son in America mourned. Remittances from Europe stopped for some three years. But his hopes were high, nevertheless. In the liberal spirit, characteristic of the early phase of the reign of Tsar Alexander I, Mimi was granted permission to come to Russia,

to claim her father's property, and, unofficially, to share its proceeds with her priest-brother in America. Mimi journeyed to Russia in the summer of 1808, and for four years sent to Loretto sums of money. But it was well into 1809 before this aid reached America, and then the sums proved small and diminishing with each year. The cost of Mimi's journey and legal battle, as well as the general depressing influence of the Napoleonic wars of the time, kept Mimi's help a mere trickle. If anything, the glad news she had sent in 1808 soon proved disastrous: it had encouraged Father Smith-Gallitzin to contract new obligations at Loretto, and now there was really no money to meet these and earlier notes.

The tidings of the favorable decision of the St. Petersburg authorities had a telling effect in these forests of Pennsylvania. Many years later Father Lemcke noted: "Old people still relate of the talk that went . . . as if all the treasures of the Russian empire could be commandeered for the purpose of changing the Alleghanies into a paradise."

Even some of his most recalcitrant enemies were impressed, especially after the state legislature of Pennsylvania solemnly verified, late in 1809, that Father Smith was in truth Prince Gallitzin. This was done solely to make valid sundry deeds and other legal documents signed by him in either manner, but the word spread up hill and down dale that this priest was indeed a nobleman who had chosen his back-breaking, heart-sickening life on the frontier of his own volition.

The number of his partisans grew. In 1808, to accommodate the increasing flock, the church was rebuilt to twice its original size. Father Gallitzin, as he now called and signed himself after the act of the legislature, made gestures of reconciliation in his turn. In the war of 1812 he helped Captain Richard McGuire (old Michael's son) to recruit and drill a company of soldiers to fight the British. The backwoods Americans cheered; the Irish were glad that this aristocratic *pater* was telling them to shoot the hated English. But deep in his heart the priest grieved: he was now an ally of the godless French, who were at war with the land of his forefathers, Russia!

The invasion of Russia by Napoleon was actually a blow at Loretto. For, although finally winning her right to their father's estates in Russia, Mimi could send hardly anything to her brother in Pennsylvania: the family estates were directly

in the path of the invasion, and for years thereafter lay in ruins, yielding little to the Golitsyns. When Father Gallitzin's sister did manage to sell some heirlooms or other property, there was a new claimant to the proceeds. This was a Prince de Salm, Mimi's newly acquired husband, whose extravagance was notorious. And so it came about that, when Father Gallitzin's childhood friend, now the King of the Netherlands and Duke of Luxemburg, wished to help the priest and his Loretto by buying the famous gem collection of the Golitsyns for \$20,000, Prince de Salm appropriated and flung away in riotous living nearly one-half of this sum.

Mimi died in 1824, and no real help from Europe reached the Alleghanies after that, certainly nothing to match the family's earlier subsidies. But the fame of this missionary was spreading in America. He had influential friends: Henry Clay, Charles Carroll, and others of similar high stations in Washington and elsewhere. There is a story that a Russian ambassador in Washington decided to be nice to his celebrated countryman; he lent Father Gallitzin the sum of \$5,000, and then lighted a cigar with the priest's note, thus making him a present of the amount. This is supposed to have happened at a dinner in the American capital at which Father Gallitzin was a guest together with Henry Clay.

And still the debts were only dented. The priest lived frugally, almost in need, while paying off his creditors. Finally, in 1827, he issued a public appeal for funds. Charles Carroll was the first to respond with one hundred dollars; Cardinal Cappellari (who was to become Pope Gregory XVI) gave two hundred dollars.

VII

The priest's creditors were mainly Protestants of Baltimore and Quakers of Philadelphia, and on the whole they were decent to him, waiting patiently. But nearer home, in western Pennsylvania, Father Gallitzin was confronted with an outburst of virulent anti-Catholic feeling and agitation as early as 1814.

On Thanksgiving Day of that year a Protestant minister of Huntington preached a bitter sermon against "the Popery," branding it as the only real foe of the young American nation.

Father Gallitzin replied with a series of letters which were published early in 1815 in the *Huntington Gazette*. They were considered by the Catholics so telling an answer that the series was collected into a brochure, entitled *A Defence of Catholic Principles*, and published in 1816. The next year the Protestant minister issued a rejoinder, in "ungentlemanly language" as Father Gallitzin sorrowfully defined it. The priest's answer, in 1817, was a pamphlet under the title, *An Appeal to the Protestant Public*. In 1820, Father Gallitzin wrote and published *A Letter to a Protestant Friend on the Holy Scriptures*. In 1834, he produced *Six Letters of Advice to the Gentlemen Presbyterian Parsons Who Lately Met at Columbia for the Purpose of Declaring War Against the Catholic Church*. In 1836, his final pamphlet came off the press, *The Bible: Truth and Charity, a Subject of Meditation for the Editors of Certain Periodicals Mis-called Religious Publications*.

This polemic output was much appreciated by the Church. Conversions were claimed by Father Gallitzin as the result of the argument started by that "anti-Popery" sermon of the Huntington minister. Most popular was the very first pamphlet. Beginning with 1816, in an expanded form, it went through several editions in America and Ireland, and crossed the water to the continent of Europe in a number of translations. Father Gallitzin's other pamphlets were also reprinted in New York and other important centers decades and decades later.

Perhaps because of his new renown as a writer, enhancing his older fame as a colonizer for the Church, he was proposed in 1821 for the See of Cincinnati by one bishop, and in 1833, for the See of Detroit by another, but in both cases a certain archbishop opposed the appointment, and the Russian remained in his Alleghanies. By that time he was growing mellow as well as old, and did not seem to be hurt. His friends said he did not want to be moved from his flock anyway. There is indeed ample evidence that he declined these offers of promotion. But in the early 1820s he accepted the vicarage general of western Pennsylvania (its boundaries definitely set in 1827), for this meant he could remain at Loretto.

His old friend Bishop Carroll died in 1815. For years before that, Philadelphia and not Baltimore had been the ^{city} to which Father Gallitzin journeyed on the business of his parish.

In time, as the feeling of anti-Catholicism grew in its intensity along the seaboard, the hierarchy of Philadelphia sought Father Gallitzin's advice, and the aging priest traveled to that center to hear of the trouble and make his suggestions on combating it.

At home he both prospered and struggled. In 1817, he had the original log chapel torn down, and a commodious frame church built instead. In 1832, his debts practically cleared, Father Gallitzin had a chapel erected in addition, naming it St. Mary's, doubtless after his old seminary of Baltimore. But there was new trouble, too; on a tableland some three or four miles from where the priest lived, an Irish village was established, called Munster—in honor of the town of his youthful study in Germany, as some people thought, or after a locality in Ireland, as others insisted—and for a time this settlement was the very heart of opposition to Father Gallitzin.

VIII

It was in the woods on the way from Munster to Loretto, in 1834, that Father Lemcke, the young German priest sent by the diocese to assist Father Gallitzin, met a strange procession; a team of two horses, one ridden by a man, pulling a clumsy vehicle along the trail between the pines, and what a vehicle! Despite the warmish autumn day, it was a sled. Inside, reading a book, reclined "an old Reverend gentleman with snow-white hair, wide-brimmed, badly-worn hat, and a coat of homespun twill, but noble in bearing and mien—it was Gallitzin."

The above quotation is from the writings of Father Lemcke himself, who also recorded this conversation:

I rode up and asked: "Are you really the pastor of Loretto?"

"Yes, I am he."

"Prince Gallitzin?"

"At your service, I am that very exalted personage," saying this, he laughed heartily. "You may perhaps wonder," he said, when I presented to him a letter from the Bishop of Philadelphia, "at my singular retinue. But how can it be helped? We have not as yet, as you see, roads fit for wagons; we should be either fast or upset every moment. I cannot any longer ride horseback, having injured myself by a fall, and it is also coming hard for me to walk; besides I have all the requirements for Mass to take with me. . . ."

The newcomer turned his horse around to accompany the old priest to the latter's destination, which eventually proved to be a large farmhouse in a clearing beyond the woods. The idyl that followed is worth reciting:

Here lived Joshua Parrish, one of the first settlers of that community, and the ancestor of a numerous posterity. The Catholics of the neighborhood, men, women and children, were already assembled in great numbers around the house, in which an altar was set up, its principal materials having been taken from the sled; Gallitzin then sat down in one corner of the house to hear confessions, and I, in another corner, attended to a few Germans. The whole affair appeared very strange to me, but it was extremely touching to see the simple peasant home, with all its house furniture, and the great fireplace in which there was roasting and boiling going on at the same time, changed into a church; while the people, with their prayer books and their reverential manners, stood or knelt under the low projecting roof or under the trees, going in or out, just as their turn came for confession. After Mass, at which Father Gallitzin preached, and when a few children had been baptized, the altar was taken away, and the dinner table set in its place. . . . In a word, it was so pleasant and friendly that involuntarily the love-feasts of the first Christians came to my mind. In the afternoon we went slowly on our way, Gallitzin in his sled and I on horseback, arriving at nightfall at Loretto.

Father Lemcke was not pleased, however, when Father Gallitzin refused to let him live in Loretto, but assigned the aide to the northern part of Cambria County. Though growing infirm in body, Father Gallitzin remained determined to live alone, to rule Loretto as its sole leader, and to die in a practically undivided harness.

His tears were more copious in these closing years as he preached his sermons, mostly in English but at times also in his curious combination of an outdated German, some English verbs with German prefixes and suffixes, and a number of elegant French expressions. Yet, there are legends that in his old age the Apostle of the Alleghanies happily lacked much of his erstwhile harshness, that a Russian samovar would be pressed into its tea-dispensing duty to favored visitors, and that to such guests Father Gallitzin was a musician as well as a singer and a fine raconteur. He would regale his listeners with stories of his childhood and youth in Europe. There was a touch of nostalgia to his tales, as if the priest-Prince felt that his last day was soon to dawn without his revisiting the early scenes of his life.

In his Easter Sunday sermon in 1840 he told his parishioners

that he was to die shortly. Indeed, a few days later he took to bed, and on May 6 died. He was not quite seventy years old.

In 1899, a bronze statue was erected over his tomb in Loretto. His coat of arms, and that of his mother's family; his violin, books, old clock, wooden candlesticks, and other belongings may be seen in the renovated St. Mary's chapel at Loretto. These days Loretto is a town of a few hundred people, but a mining town near by, of 3,600, is named Gallitzin. At the eastern end of Gallitzin, a tunnel pierces its way through the Mississippi-Atlantic divide, and it also bears the misspelled name of the Prince. There is, besides, Prince Gallitzin Spring near Duncanville, in the same Pennsylvania.

At Loretto, the imposing Catholic church of stone, built in 1901, is a gift of Charles M. Schwab, the steel magnate, who two years earlier was also the donor of the Prince's bronze statue over the tomb. Schwab, born in another Pennsylvania town, was brought to Loretto as a child of five. He grew up and was educated in Loretto. It was Loretto that gave him his first job on his way to his riches.

For the countryside abounded in opportunities ever since the Russian nobleman chose it for himself and for his charges. Prince Dmitri Dmitrievich Golitsyn, the Russian who never saw Russia, chose and did well developing this part of the American frontier with his father's Russian money. With all his faults, he did nobly, even if few people ever understood him.

But then, he hardly understood himself and the forces that drove him to these horizons.¹

¹The three most important volumes on Prince Golitsyn are: Thomas Heyden, *Life and Character of Rev. Prince Demetrius A. de Gallitzin* (Baltimore, 1869); Sarah M. Brownson, *Life of Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, Prince and Priest*, with an introduction by O. A. Brownson (New York, 1872); and Peter Henry Lemcke, *Life and Work of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1940), which is a translation by the Rev. Joseph C. Plump of Heinrich Lemcke's *Leben und Wirken des Prinzen Demetrius Augustin Gallitzin* published in Muenster, Germany, in 1861.

Golitsyn's own writings are to be found in Grace Murphy, ed., *Gallitzin's Letters, a Collection of the Polemical Works of the Very Reverend Prince Demetrius Gallitzin* (Loretto, Pa., the Anglemodde Press, 1940—"this special edition of 500 copies is issued in commemoration of the centenary of the author's death").

Other books and articles on Prince Golitsyn are listed on page xxi of Rev. Plump's translation of Lemcke's book; also at the conclusion of Ferdinand Kittell's article in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, volume VI (New York: Robert Appleton Company

1909), pp. 367-69; and at the end of Richard J. Purcell's essay in *Dictionary of American Biography*, volume VII (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931), pp. 113-15.

Very little has been written on Golitsyn in Russian or by Russian authors. There is, however, a biographical sketch of our Golitsyn and another of his father in *Entsyklopedichesky Slovar' F. A. Brokgauza i I. A. Yefrona*, volume IX (St. Petersburg, 1893), pp. 51-52. A relative of our Golitsyn wrote and published a book on the Apostle of the Alleghanies in French. He was Prince Avgustin Petrovich Golitsyn, a Catholic and a son of a Catholic, who spent much of his life in Paris where, in 1856, he issued his *Un missionnaire russe en Amerique*, containing a French translation of Prince Demetrius Augustine's *A Defence of Catholic Principles*.

The bi-lingual (Russian and English) magazine published by the Czech Benedictine Fathers at the St. Procopius Abbey, Lisle, Illinois, *Tserkovnyi Golos*—[*The Voice of the Church*], carried in its issues of 1937-39 reprints and translations of two of Golitsyn's biographies: *Priest, Prince and Pioneer* by John J. Gorrell, and *The Sword of the Russian Prince* by Cecilia M. Young.

My quotation of John J. Gorrell's view of Prince Golitsyn is taken from page 13 of *The Voice of the Church* for October 1937. For the source of my quotation of Lemcke's description of his first meeting with Golitsyn, see the Rev. Modestus Wirtner, *The Benedictine Fathers in Cambria County, Pennsylvania* (Carrolltown, Pennsylvania, 1926), pages 35-37.

From Pushkin's "Eugene Onegin"

Translated from the Russian

By VLADIMIR NABOKOV

Chapter I

XXXII

Diana's bosom, Flora's dimple
are very charming, I agree—
but there's a greater charm, less simple,
—the instep of Terpsichore.
By prophesying to the eye
a prize with which no prize can vie
'tis a fair token and a snare
for swarms of daydreams. Everywhere
its grace, sweet reader, I admire:
at long-hemmed tables, half-concealed,
in spring, upon a velvet field,
in winter, at a grated fire,
in ballrooms, on a glossy floor,
on the bleak boulders of a shore.

XXXIII

I see the surf, the storm-rack flying. . . .
Oh, how I wanted to compete
with the tumultuous breakers dying
in adoration at her feet!
Together with those waves—how much
I wished to kiss what they could touch!
No—even when my youth would burn
its fiercest—never did I yearn
with such a torturing sensation
to kiss the lips of nymphs, the rose
that on the cheek of beauty glows
or breasts in mellow palpitation—
no, never did a passion roll
such billows in my bursting soul.

XXXIV

Sometimes I dream of other minutes
by hidden memory retold—
and feel her little ankle in its
contented stirrup which I hold;
again to build mad builders start;
again within a withered heart
one touch engenders fire; again
—the same old love, the same old pain. . . .
But really, my loquacious lyre
has lauded haughty belles too long
—for they deserve neither the song,
nor the emotions they inspire:
eyes, words—all their enchantments cheat
as much as do their pretty feet.

The Russian Translation Project of the American Council of Learned Societies

By W. CHAPIN HUNTINGTON

THE aim of the Russian Translation Project is the translation into English of distinguished Russian works in the fields of the humanities and the social sciences, in order to promote a better understanding in America of Russian culture and the Russian mind.

It seems hardly necessary to justify such a project. The need for basic works about Russia by Russians, which are accessible to American readers in translation, became acute after the First World War and the Revolution of 1917, and it has increased with the growth of the U.S.S.R. as a world power. It is remarkable how long the barriers of geographical isolation, cultural tradition, and the Cyrillic alphabet have kept our scholars in ignorance of the real Russia. And it would be tragic indeed if this false sense of remoteness, of abnormality, and of unreality, should continue.

In bridging the gap between the cultures, however, neither journalism, no matter what its news coverage and competence, nor even the best evaluations of foreign writers in the more permanent form of books, can take the place of an adequate and growing library of standard works by Russian scholars. Such works we have long possessed about the better known countries of Western Europe, either in the more familiar languages like French or German, or in satisfactory English translation.

A vast store of scientific and scholarly materials has been produced and is today being produced in Russia, very little of which has ever been translated into any Western European tongue. For instance, in such an authoritative work as the third edition of Sir William Dampier's *History of Science*, published in 1943, the name of the Russian scientist Mikhail Vasilievich Lomonosov (1711-1765), a universal mind comparable to Benjamin Franklin, or any in the western world, is not even mentioned. Such examples could be multiplied.

The Russian Translation Project of the American Council of Learned Societies was established with the aid of a grant from the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation, in the hope that it might give an impulse to a movement for the translation of outstanding Russian works which would continue and expand long after the grant itself had been expended. The Project is in the nature of an experiment to see what can be done and how best to do it. The experiment is still so new that this account of it cannot pretend to be more than an interim report.

Perhaps it will help to clarify matters at the outset, to state what the Project is not and what it does not attempt to do. Although it seeks the widest possible circle of serious readers for its translations, the Project is not an enterprise of popularization but expects to find its clientele among American scholars and the broader outlying group of persons with definite intellectual interests. Belles-lettres are excluded from its field because most of the classic works, especially of prose and drama (although not of poetry), are already accessible in English. Moreover, publication of such translations is commercially profitable and, therefore, in no need of encouragement.

Finally, those responsible for the Project do not contemplate that it should lessen, even in the slightest degree, the need for the spread of Russian language studies in the United States. Therefore, they have eliminated from their list highly specialized and technical books in fields where Russian achievement is so important that American specialists in those branches ought to know Russian in order to keep abreast of developments vital to them. The same is true of the field of Russian (or Slavic) studies itself,—linguistics, philology, history—since those to whom such works could be useful, may be presumed to be able to read them in their original form.

Of course no translation program which could be supported could include more than a fraction of the vast accumulated store and current production of Russian materials. It follows that very careful choice of the items to be translated is the first requisite of a successful program. These items will fall into three main categories.

Most titles will be single books, requiring faithful, idiomatic translation in an acceptable literary style, together with the

necessary equipment of annotations, appendices, and bibliography.

More difficult will be the anthologies or symposia, gathered round a central theme. These introduce the problem of wise editorial selection of suitable extracts, essays, or letters, and of their logical arrangement. Anthologies are planned to deal with such capital themes as Russian critical literature of the nineteenth century and the Russian national character.

Articles from scholarly journals and serious periodicals present the problem of discriminating choice from a bewildering mass of material, chiefly contemporary. It is recognized that such articles are bound to be more fragmentary and disconnected than consistent volumes of works, with consequent danger of dispersing energy and funds without achieving a lasting result. Nevertheless, the Project is experimenting in this field and has entered into an arrangement notably with the *Journal of Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, by which this journal will publish, over a certain period, a series of translations on related subjects.

Of course this form of continuous publication in a scholarly quarterly is practically a symposium in one broad field, and it possesses some of the unity and coherence of a single book. This would not be true of occasional articles, scattered through various periodicals.

In order to compose a register of titles desirable for translation, an enquiry was sent out in the beginning to a carefully compiled list of some two hundred scholars throughout the United States who were familiar with the Russian language and occupied with some phase of Russian studies—university teachers, government officials, publicists, and writers. The fruit of this enquiry, response to which was prompt and generous, was a list of about one hundred and fifty titles, of which fifty clearly fell within the range of the Russian Translation Project. Not all of these, however, were of the same degree of immediacy. As was doubtless to be expected, the replies from universities and colleges tended to emphasize books much needed as collateral reading by students in various courses where such material scarcely exists at present.

While there is, of course, no question as to the value of such reference works in furthering the aims of the Project, nevertheless the administrative committee felt that they should occupy

a secondary place in its program. First place was reserved for works of a basic character, a sort of "five-foot shelf" of books constituting what might be called an "orientation course" of reading. Many of these books would, of course, serve a dual purpose, being likewise adapted to the collateral reading of students.

As to the period to which they belong or their date of publication, the books may be old or new, products of the Imperial or of the Soviet régime, depending solely upon their worth for the task in hand. Of course it is likely that, in the long run, books produced under the Soviet régime will exceed those drawn from the past. It is assumed that Russian history is a continuum—it was not interrupted by, nor did it begin with the Soviet régime which has controlled Russia's destinies for nearly a generation. By the same token, the adjective "Russian" is freely used, not only as the proper name for the Great Russian language but as the historic name of a country and a sovereignty, even though its official title be the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In the selection of works for translation, the task is easier with books of the past, since time and experience have proved their value. The choice is more difficult in dealing with the literary output of a contemporary civilization which is so rapidly developing, so constantly changing, so articulate, and so didactic as that of the Soviet Union. Desirous as one may be of keeping abreast of developments in this dynamic situation (to use a favorite Soviet adjective), it is difficult to choose from the flood of Soviet writing works of originality and scholarship, reflecting ideas and policies so permanent as to warrant the expense of translating and publishing the material in book form.

The administrative committee of the Project has endeavored to make haste slowly, so that at the present time there are twelve books in various phases of translation, as follows:

Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers and Europe*. A compact work discussing one of the threads which run through the whole of Russian thinking: "Does Russia belong to Asia or to Europe?"—the conflict between the Slavophils and the Westernizers.

Menshutkin, *Life of Lomonosov*. Lomonosov was the Benjamin Franklin of Russia; an eighteenth century scientist and the

"father of modern Russian literature," a physical and mental giant, who rose from poverty to the heights. The author, Professor Boris Menshutkin, was a distinguished chemist and historian of science, the greatest authority on the life and work of Lomonosov. Preface by Tenney L. Davis of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for many years a friend and correspondent of Menshutkin, who also furnished original illustrations from the Russian edition of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

Kaidanova-Bervy, *Outlines of the History of Public Education in Russia and the U.S.S.R.* A somewhat discursive but fascinating history of this important subject over the past seventy-five years by a remarkable woman who was a participant in it. This work is unique in throwing light on a hitherto neglected phase of Russian history, the liberal movement in education under the Imperial régime. It supplies a necessary background for the proper understanding of subsequent developments in the field of education.

Balzak, and others, *Economic Geography of the U.S.S.R.* The most important contemporary work on the subject. Human geography and representative of modern Russian economic and geographical thinking.

Berg, and others, "*Priroda.*" A discussion of the natural regions of Russia. Considered the best physical geography of the U.S.S.R.

These two translations are designed to meet a pressing demand for authoritative works on the geography of the U.S.S.R., as well as to provide such a basic knowledge of the geographic background as is essential to the comprehension of Russian humanistic literature.

Vyshinsky, *Soviet State Law.* The standard description of the content, philosophy, and operation of the Soviet Constitution by the leading Soviet jurist, who is at present Vice-Commissar of Foreign Affairs.

Varneke, *History of the Russian Theatre.* A standard Russian work on the subject, re-edited in 1939 on the basis of the 1913 edition. Begins with the folk-origins of Russian drama and carries the development down to the present. Supplied with full annotations especially for the American reader.

Livanova, Pekelis, Popova, *History of Russian Music.* The most satisfactory recent history of Russian music. A Soviet

work which goes deeply into the origins of the Russian folk-song, whose melodic and harmonic traditions were the source of the great Russian musical compositions of the nineteenth century. Contains a wealth of musical examples.

Grabar, History of Russian Art. The monumental six-volume history of Russian architecture, painting, and sculpture by Igor Grabar and more than twenty collaborators, which was published in 1909. Splendidly illustrated. The classic work in its field, containing material not to be found elsewhere.

Anthology of Russian Critical Writers of the Nineteenth Century. Literary criticism of Belinsky, his contemporaries and successors, (e.g. Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev) which, under an authoritarian government which forbade direct criticism of the social and political structure, was really social criticism, the only vehicle of attack on the existing order. The works of the nineteenth century critics are now being re-studied by Soviet thinkers, as containing the seeds of their own order.

The merit of the translations sponsored and therefore the success of the Project itself depend upon the competence of the translators chosen. Here we face the problem of translation in general and of Russian translation in particular.

In the initial enquiry sent out to scholars, correspondents were asked to recommend the names of "persons outstandingly fitted to engage upon such translation—and available." A considerable number of names were thus obtained and to these as well as to others secured elsewhere a special information blank was sent, designed to bring out the main facts regarding the education, experience, and special qualifications of each applicant. Thus a roster of sixty-five translators has been assembled, at least a quarter of whom are persons of exceptional competence. It must be understood that this is not an exhaustive list of all the competent translators from Russian into English in America, but rather a list, certified by persons of academic standing, of translators who are at present available: i.e. who have spare time which they would be glad to devote to a project of genuine cultural interest and benefit.

Of the translators on the roster, those who are native Russians outnumber the native Americans four to one, testimony both to the dearth until recent times of Russian studies in the

United States and to the immigration within the last quarter century of Russians of the intellectual class.

What are the qualifications of a competent translator? Judged by the experience of the Russian Translation Project thus far, they are:

1. The ability to write good idiomatic English, sustained throughout a full book.
2. A thorough knowledge of Russian.
3. A background of Russian history and civilization.
4. Objectivity in the translation of controversial material.
5. Training and experience in the special field of the book to be translated: e.g. history, music, law, etc.
6. For books published since the advent of the Soviet régime, a knowledge of Communist theory, Soviet institutions, and contemporary life in the U.S.S.R.
7. For books published under the Imperial régime, a knowledge of the political and social conditions of that period.
8. Experience in the art of translation itself.

And for good measure:

9. Thorough education and broad culture.
10. Literary appreciation.

Possibly, certain of these conditions or the order of their arrangement may seem strange to some readers and to require some explanation.

Any editor will say "Amen" to the requirement that the translator write good idiomatic English. Anyone who has ever waded through a translation in poor English or Russian-English, uncertain whether to try to repair it or to discard the whole, will know what is meant. Probably a good many translators are capable of sustaining an idiomatic English style throughout a short letter or article but not through a full-length book.

Without a background of Russian history and civilization, it is impossible to go far in a translation without mistaking a meaning or failing to render a nuance. No mere dictionary acquaintance will suffice for more than the simplest translations. Lack of such background is likely to be a weakness of

recent American students of Russian, who should not be assigned tasks beyond their strength.

The Russian Revolution and the establishment of an economic system different in principle from our own have raised a cloud of controversial questions. In many Soviet writings there is a note of fervent evangelism which may seem like self-righteousness and arrogance to the reader who comes upon them for the first time. An honest translator will render such passages with entire detachment, seeking to put himself in the place of the writer. Persons incapable of such scholarly objectivity ought not to undertake controversial material of this kind.

It is obvious that in any special field such as law or architecture, a translator with special knowledge of the subject has a great advantage. He has the acquaintance with the concepts and technical terms, which a cultivated layman lacks, and the accuracy of his work is greatly facilitated by his mastery of the craft itself. Thus, in practice, where perfection in translators can hardly be attained, such special knowledge tends to counterbalance weakness in other requirements.

It is difficult to see how anyone without a knowledge of Soviet Russia since November 1917—of Communist theory, industrial organization and education; and, specifically, of the living Soviet-Russian language with its new words, new uses of old words, abbreviations, slang, and informal modes of expression,—could translate Soviet books accurately.

On the other hand there are persons available as translators who, although they have lived and worked in the Soviet Union and know contemporary Russian fluently, have no knowledge of the old Russia, no background with which to measure the present or to understand its evolution. Such translators should be confined to strictly contemporary works where such background is not essential.

If there is one thing of which those in charge of the Russian Translation Project are convinced, it is that no translator whose work is not well known should be commissioned to do a job, without a thorough test. Experience has already shown that fluency in conversation or even ability to write a satisfactory letter do not necessarily mean that an applicant is capable of sustaining clarity of expression throughout an entire book.

If all these qualifications seem counsels of perfection, leading to an attitude of defeatism, such is not at all the conclusion reached by the editors of the Project. Nor is it their opinion that this urgent translation program should be postponed indefinitely until a corps of ideally qualified translators should have become trained and available. Rather they believe that even the limited experience gained thus far has proved that there is a much more practical and constructive alternative possible. This would involve three stages:

1. Choosing the best available translators.
2. Fitting the translator to the job.
3. Compensating the translator's omissions and errors by competent supervision and careful editing.

Already this policy is working out happily in practice. Distinguished scholars in a number of outstanding instances have been most generous in offering to supervise the work of translators as it proceeds; and in other cases the contribution of the translations has been of such interest in certain special fields that scholars in these fields have been found ready to give them a critical examination.

Nothing has been said in this interim report about publication, because this problem has not yet been thoroughly explored. It is of course under study, and various interesting proposals have been made. Judging by the responses thus far received to the list of translations undertaken by the Project, there should not be great difficulty in making ultimately satisfactory publishing arrangements and in effecting a wide distribution.

The Russian Translation Project is a new venture in its field and those in charge of it, being keenly aware of their responsibilities and limitations, would welcome counsel or suggestions from all who are interested and in sympathy with its aim.

Economic Reconstruction in the Soviet Union

By SOLOMON M. SCHWARZ

THE German occupation covered a vast territory in the Soviet Union, including some of its economically most developed regions, and left behind it a frightful devastation. The economic reconstruction of these regions started immediately after their liberation, while the war still continued. It is obvious that this reconstruction will not be completed by the end of the war and will call for further strenuous efforts in the postwar period. The problem will be complicated by the fact that already in the prewar years, and still more during the war, the whole national economy of the Soviet Union and its industry in particular was geared to the demands of national defense. Thus, alongside with the rebuilding of what has been destroyed, the Soviet Union will face another task of great magnitude, that of reconverting its economy to peacetime requirements. Moreover, it will be necessary to continue the unfinished work of the country's industrialization and the geographical redistribution of its economy. Finally, postwar reconstruction will not be able to avoid the problem of financial rehabilitation and, most important of all, the combatting of the inflation which began before the war and which, during the war years, assumed catastrophic proportions. As the size of this article does not permit me to cover the problem in its entirety, I shall limit myself to the discussion of the economic reconstruction of those regions which were devastated by war and enemy occupation.¹

From a purely quantitative point of view, the regions occupied by the Germans constituted only a small part of the territory of the Soviet Union: about five percent within the boundaries of 1939, and about seven percent if one takes into

¹I shall also leave out the reconstruction policy with regard to the transportation system and the rebuilding of cities, limiting myself to agriculture and industry.

account the territory annexed in 1939-40. But these were the regions most densely populated and with the most developed agriculture, industry, and transportation system. According to the census of 1939, the population of the regions which had been either totally or partially occupied by the enemy constituted about sixty millions.² Thus the occupied regions contained more than thirty-five percent of the prewar population of the Union, while, if one adds the newly acquired territories, this percentage would rise to over forty. It is true that many European countries, such as France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Greece were subject to total occupation, but it seems that nowhere, except perhaps in Poland, did the occupation leave such a complete devastation as in the Soviet Union and nowhere, therefore, does the problem of economic reconstruction arise on such a truly gigantic scale.

This problem became the immediate concern of the Soviet government as early as in August 1943. At that time, less than one third of the occupied territory of the Union was liberated, and this did not include the rich industrial sections of the Ukraine, except the eastern part of the Donbas. Those in charge of reconstruction could, therefore, concentrate their attention on the rehabilitation of agriculture and transport. The decree "On the emergency measures for the economic reconstruction of regions liberated from German occupation," issued by the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party on August 21, 1943, dealt at length with the problems of agriculture and railroad transport and gave some attention to rebuilding of houses and to measures of social relief, but did not tackle as yet the problems of industrial reconstruction.

II

The principles of agricultural rehabilitation which were formulated by the decree of August 21, 1943, with reference to

²Totally occupied were the whole of the Ukraine, White Russia, and the following regions of the R.S.F.S.R.: Smolensk, Orel, Kursk, Rostov, Krasnodar, Ordzhonikidze (Stavropol'), and the Crimea. Among the partially occupied regions the most important were Leningrad, Kalinin, Moscow, Voronezh, and Stalingrad. The population of the U.S.S.R. in 1939 was 170,500,000.

the eight regions of the R.S.F.S.R. which were liberated by this time, subsequently were applied to newly liberated regions, including those of the Ukraine and White Russia. This program envisaged vigorous measures for the restoration of live stock and machine-tractor stations, while it was expected that in all other respects the agricultural restoration largely would take care of itself, with some limited assistance on the part of the state, such as seed loans for instance.

The restoration of live stock was placed at the head of the program, as without this no rehabilitation either of the collective or of the individual peasant economy could be achieved. Although no total figures have been published as to the losses in live stock during the years of occupation, it can be assumed that collectivized live stock, of which only a small part could have been evacuated to the east, perished almost in its entirety as did also much of the live stock owned by the individual members of the collective farms.

The decree of August 21 ordered the immediate return to the liberated regions of the live stock which was evacuated to the east before the coming of the Germans. This was a task of immense magnitude. As it was impossible to use the railroads, already highly overtaxed by the requirements of war, there began early in September the epic homeward trek of great herds, some of which had to be driven a distance of many hundred miles. Emergency feed and veterinary stations were established along the road, and many veterinaries were detached from the army in connection with this task. By the end of October, all the herds reached their destination. Altogether, about six hundred thousand heads of live stock were brought back. Impressive as this figure is, it formed only a small part of the prewar live stock as can be seen from the following table which refers to the eight regions affected by the decree of August 21:

	Prewar live stock (in thousands)	Returned
Cattle	7,561	197
Sheep and goats	10,235	341
Hogs	4,562	—
Horses	2,508	53

In other words, the returned live stock was only 2.6% of the prewar cattle, 3.3% of sheep and goats, and 2.1% of horses. With regard to the hogs the situation was still worse. They were not even mentioned in the decree of August 21. It is difficult to drive hogs for great distances, and one may assume that the number of evacuated hogs was insignificant.

It is important to note that the returned live stock was handed over in its entirety to the collective farms, irrespective of its prewar ownership. Because of this, the percentage of live stock returned to the collectives is higher than the figures shown above: 8.1% for the cattle, 7.9% for the sheep and goats, and 2.5% for the horses. But even so, this constituted only the very beginning of the restoration of the collectivized live stock, and was, of course, not enough. The decree of August 21 also provided for the buying of live stock in non-devastated regions and for a system of contracts to be concluded between the collective farms and their individual members for the breeding by the latter of live stock, subsequently to be sold to the collectives at low, government prices. This virtually meant an obligatory surrender of live stock by the individual members to their collectives.

Early in February of 1944, the Committee for the Economic Restoration of the Liberated Regions published a report on the fulfilment of the program formulated in the decree of August 21.³ This report permits us to establish the relative importance of the various methods of restoration of collectivized live stock. The picture is as follows:

Methods of restoration	Cattle	Sheep and Goats (in thousands)	Hogs	Horses
Returned	197	341	—	53.0
Gifts from non-devastated regions	12	25	—	1.7
Bought in non-devastated regions	69	254	55	11.0
Bought from individual members under contract	590	186	—	—
Total	868	806	55	65.7

³*Izvestiya*, February 5, 1944.

These data clearly show that, as far as collectivized horses and hogs were concerned, the process of restoration was only in its initial stage, to the extent of 3.0% for horses and 5.4% for hogs. Much better results were shown with regard to collectivized sheep and goat (18.8%) and to cattle (35.8%). The last figure is particularly impressive, but this result was achieved not so much by returning evacuated live stock or by buying it in non-devastated regions, as by the system of local contracts (to the extent of 68%). This means that the collectivized cattle is being restored mostly at the expense of live stock individually owned by the peasants who had just been liberated from German oppression and exploitation.

With the liberation of the Ukraine, this basic tendency of the live stock restoration policy became even more pronounced. Here there could be no question of the return of live stock because, in the conditions under which the region was occupied by the Germans in 1941, no evacuation of live stock in any great number had been possible. We know also that only a very small number of live stock was received by the Ukraine from the non-devastated regions. Consequently, in the Ukrainian collective farms the whole weight of the restoration of the live stock fell almost exclusively upon the shoulders of their individual members. In fact, we have the statement of one important Communist official that "almost all the offspring of the cows belonging to the members of the Ukrainian collective farms was to be turned over to the latter under contract."⁴ Clearly, this is not so much a restoration of live stock as its redistribution between the collective farms and their individual members. It must be noted, however, that subsequently, in the spring of 1944, the government bought over a million heads of cattle, sheep, and goats in the eastern and north-eastern parts of the country, for the collective farms of the Ukraine, and White Russia, as well as in the Leningrad, Smolensk, Orel, Voronezh, and Briansk regions.⁵ Thus, without departing from the basic principles of its policy, the government was forced to somewhat modify it under the pressure of practical necessity.

⁴*Pravda*, July 1, 1944.

⁵*Trud*, October 28, 1944.

III

There was one field, however, that of agricultural machinery, in which from the beginning the work of restoration was carried out by means of vigorous governmental action and not largely at the expense of local resources.

The last decade before the war was characterized in the Soviet Union by a rapid mechanization of agriculture. Today it is hard to imagine large-scale collective agriculture without the wide application of machines and tractors. As is known, in the Soviet Union these machines are not the property of the collective farms, but are concentrated in special machine-tractor stations belonging to the state and run by government officials. These stations, which do much work in the collective fields in return for payment in kind, represent, so to say, state outposts amidst the peasant ocean, and their speedy restoration was dictated by political as well as economic considerations. Machine-tractor stations were reestablished everywhere within a few months after liberation although often with fewer machines and tractors than before. They play an important part in the agricultural restoration of the devastated regions, but the effective use of the machines is greatly limited by difficulties in fuel supply and especially by the drastic reduction in the number of draft animals. From various localities comes information of the use of cows as draft animals and of the performance of many basic agricultural operations by means of manual labor, including in some cases even the cultivation of the soil with spades.

This is a very heavy additional burden on the population, particularly in view of the almost complete absence in the countryside of adult male workers. The work is done mostly by women and also by adolescents and old men. In spite of all these difficulties, however, the Russian country side is apparently succeeding in coping with the tremendous problems of economic reconstruction.

IV

Other measures of agricultural reconstruction include seed loans to the population of devastated regions, granting of credits for the rebuilding of houses, and remission of various state duties. By the decree of August 21, 1943, a seed loan in

the
lecti
tion
of th
194
tals
tion
harv
Wit
loan
actu

A
regi
hou
the
case
a ve
to t
six r
mos

E
pop
say,
agri
ject
larg
effec
for
con
ticu
scale
to b
man
wire
to t
lion
ooo
volu
region

•P,

the total amount of fifty thousand tons was granted the collective farms of the liberated regions under the following conditions: the farms of the Rostov region and of the eastern part of the Ukraine had to return the loan not later than October 15, 1943 (!) with interest of two quintals on each hundred quintals of loaned seed, and those of other regions "as an exception" were permitted not to return the loan until after the harvest of 1944, but with an interest rate of ten quintals. With the extension of the liberated territory, the amount of the loan was increased to 81,250 tons, but by the end of 1943 actually only 65 thousand tons were distributed.

Another form of help to the rural population of the liberated regions was the granting of credits for rebuilding of individual houses, in the amount of ten thousand rubles per family, with the obligation to repay the loan within seven years, in this case without interest. This measure, however, had apparently a very limited application. According to the official report, up to the end of 1943, these loans totaled only a little over thirty-six million rubles, thus benefitting not more than 3600 families, most likely specially selected.

Equally limited were the measures tending to relieve the population of the liberated regions from state duties, that is to say, primarily from the obligatory turning over to the state of agricultural products. It is hardly necessary to treat this subject in detail as any alleviation of the burden of state duties is largely annulled, and often even more than offset, by the effects of the widely and systematically organized campaigns for the "voluntary overfulfilment" of state duties and for contributions to various state funds. In the Ukraine, in particular, these campaigns were conducted on an especially wide scale. I shall cite only one example from the many that are to be found in the Soviet press. In February, 1944, the chairman of the Regional Soviet of the Dniepropetrovsk region wired Stalin that "nineteen districts alone of our region gave to the Red Army Fund and sold to the state more than 12 million poods of grain, 1,600,000 poods of sun-flower seed, 4,470,000 poods of potatoes and 167,200 poods of meat," and that as voluntary contributions "the workers of the Dniepropetrovsk region had already donated 50 million roubles for the production of military equipment."⁶ These figures are truly revealing.

⁶*Pravda*, February 27, 1944.

Over 12 million poods of grain constitutes about two hundred thousand tons, or thrice as much as the whole amount of seed loaned by the government in 1943, while 50 million roubles is nearly one-and-a-half times the amount of the credit granted by the government during the same period for the rebuilding of houses in the rural districts of the liberated regions.

Similar information comes from many other regions. It shows the extraordinary self-sacrificing spirit of the population. But it also reveals, better than anything else can, the basic tendency of the Soviet government's restoration policy: this restoration is being achieved almost entirely at the expense of local resources, and, moreover, the devastated regions, practically right after their liberation, become a source of considerable income to the state.

In the face of all these difficulties, the more remarkable appears the phenomenon of the speedy restoration of agriculture in the liberated regions. Although no complete information on the subject is available, one may assume that during the occupation the acreage under crop underwent drastic reduction. Yet, in 1944, that is to say the very first year after the liberation, the total acreage under crop of the Ukrainian collective farms already reached 65% of the prewar acreage; and that under grain, even rose as high as 73%.⁷ In White Russia, sowings reached 80%, although probably in this case only grain is meant.⁸ In regions liberated earlier, the acreage under crop apparently almost everywhere was nearing the prewar level, while in the Northern Caucasus (the Kuban region) it even exceeded it.⁹ Favorable reports of the yield (per hectare) come from many liberated regions, particularly from the south.

It is true that these achievements require an immense expenditure of human labor, much larger than that necessary in prewar years. But this prodigious effort makes probable the solution of the immediate tasks of agricultural reconstruction, insofar as grain agriculture is concerned, even before the end of the present war. In the postwar period, the main tasks will consist in raising the level of grain agriculture by improving agricultural technique, in reviving the production of diversified crops, and, above all, in restoring the live stock.

⁷*Pravda*, October 18, 1944.

⁸*Pravda*, July 6, 1944.

⁹*Izvestiya*, November 23, 1944.

V

Destruction in industry went much further than in agriculture, except for the live stock situation. A very large part of Soviet heavy industry was situated on the territory which was occupied by the Germans. Thus, in 1938, 60.8% of the coal was produced in the Donbas and 60.6% and 3.2% of iron ore in the Krivoy Rog district and the Kerch Peninsula, respectively, while in 1937, the southern works were responsible for 60.7% of the total pig iron production.¹⁰ These are just the branches of industry which do not lend themselves easily to evacuation. Both from the mines and the metallurgical works only a small part of the equipment was evacuated to the east during the first weeks of the war, together with the most skilled workers and employees. Most of the equipment was left behind and partly destroyed in accordance with the scorched earth policy. True, in many cases, this destruction was not complete because of the rapidity of the Red Army's retreat from the Ukraine, and the Germans were able to restore a part of the abandoned industries. However, later, the Germans themselves, before leaving, subjected to systematic destruction all they could not take with them.¹¹ On the day after the expulsion of the Germans, the whole coal industry and the ferrous metal industry of the Russian South lay in ruins. Also great was the damage in other fields of industry of which the sugar industry suffered perhaps the most. Before the war almost three quarters (in 1937, 73.9%) of the whole sugar industry of the Soviet Union was concentrated in the Ukraine, and besides a considerable part of the sugar industry was destroyed in the Kursk region. Heavy losses were sustained also by other branches of the food industry (alcohol, flour, canning). Very great were the losses in the cement industry, over 40% of which were situated in the Ukraine and the Northern Caucasus. On the other hand, the metal-working and machine-building industries suffered less. It is true that over one fifth (in 1937, 21.1%) of these industries were located in the Ukraine; be-

¹⁰*Sotsialisticheskoe stroitelstvo S.S.R., 1933-38.* Moscow—Leningrad, 1939, pp. 48, 55, 56.

¹¹See the report of the Extraordinary State Committee for the Investigation of Crimes Committed by the German Invaders in *The Information Bulletin of the Soviet Embassy*, November 20, 1943.

sides, considerable destruction was inflicted upon some other large centers of the machine-building industry, such as Leningrad, Stalingrad, Rostov, and others. But in these fields of industry the evacuation of equipment and of the qualified personnel was carried out on a very large scale, so that the destruction affected mostly the plant buildings. As to the other important branches of industry (oil, textiles, chemicals, most of the non-ferrous metals, and timber), these were located chiefly far from the zone of military operations, and suffered comparatively little.

While the war continues, the reconstruction of industry naturally must remain within rather narrow limits. The early plans of the Soviet government emphasized only the most urgent tasks such as the restoration of the coal and building material industries as well as the reestablishment of power plants, without which no industrial reconstruction is possible. Originally, the restoration of the ferrous metallurgy was delegated to second place as this would deflect the work of the machine-building plants from the needs of national defense, without immediate returns. In practice, however, it became necessary to modify these original plans.

The task of restoring the Donbas coal industry proved to be a particularly difficult one. Great as was the destruction in the mines, the greatest difficulty was created by the fact that they had been flooded. First, pumping operations had been discontinued during the occupation when the Germans lost hope of working the mines because of desertion on the part of the miners. Later, before their retreat, the Germans wilfully and systematically flooded the mines. As a result, at the time of the liberation of the Donbas, the quantity of water in the mines was calculated to be between 300-350 million cubic meters and was continuing to rise at the rate of over 400 thousand cubic meters every twenty-four hours, according to some experts, and over 800 thousand cubic meters, according to others.¹² From the same sources we learn that, in a little more than a year since the liberation, over 60 million cubic meters of water have been pumped out of the Donbas mines, which means that the quantity of pumped out water was considerably less than the amount entering the mines. The flooding was most severe

¹²*Pravda*, November 17, 1933; *Izvestiya*, November 3, 1944.

in the larger mines where the coal lay deeper and was of the best quality. This situation made it necessary to begin working the less profitable smaller mines, even to open new ones, as well as to recur to manual labor in view of the lack of machinery.

No wonder that under such conditions the total coal production for the first year after the liberation was very limited. For instance, the miners of the Stalino district, in their annual report to Stalin, wrote that during the year they produced over six million tons of coal, while the miners of the Voroshilovgrad district, which had been liberated earlier, reported at the same time that they had mined about six million tons of coal in the preceding nineteen months.¹¹ As before the war the Stalino district produced about 170 thousand tons a day, and the Voroshilovgrad district about 110 thousand tons, the above figures of annual production equal in both cases approximately only a thirty-five days production at the prewar rate.

Since the second half of 1944, increasing complaints began to be heard that the lag in the production of coal as well as its low-grade quality were hindering the restoration of industries, and that of the ferrous metal industry in particular. Rather unexpectedly, the restoration of this last industry started much earlier and went much faster than had been foreseen in the plans formulated immediately after the expulsion of the Germans. This revival began spontaneously due to the efforts of the workers who had remained on the spot throughout the occupation. A striking example is that of the Enakievo metallurgical plant in the Stalino region. Not appalled by the immense scale of the destruction, the local workers began to reestablish the plant, using for this not only what remained of its own equipment, but also the equipment taken from other destroyed plants in the vicinity, which in most cases was of the same standard type. This initiative was at once followed up by the industrial administration and, by the end of 1943, the first blast furnace in liberated Donbas was in operation. Similar developments took place in other plants of the region. Before long this local work of restoration found support from the outside: various plants of the Ural, Siberia, and central regions assumed "patronage" over the southern plants in the

¹¹*Pravda*, September 8 and September 12, 1944.

process of restoration. Thus, the Magnitogorsk metallurgical plant became the "patron" of the Makeevka plant, the Kuznetsk plant of Enakievo, the Moscow plant of Stalingrad, and the Cheliabinsk plant of Stalino.¹⁴ This "patronage," which was extended to other industries also, took the form of sending to the "patronized" plants of such materials which could be spared by the "patron" plants without detriment to their own work and which could be delivered without imposing too much burden on the transport. With this exception, the work of restoration was carried out by local means without any substantial importation of equipment from distant regions and without the return of evacuated workers.

In many cases the destruction proved to be less thorough-going than had been feared at first, and by the end of the first year after the liberation, there were in operation in the Stalino district 7 blast furnaces (out of the 22 functioning before the war), 23 open hearth furnaces (out of 43), 42 coke ovens (out of 78).¹⁵ Total production remained, however, on a rather low level. According to the same source of information, during the first year after liberation, there was produced in the Stalino district only 200 thousand tons of pig iron (as compared with 5 million tons in the last prewar year), and 450 tons of steel (as compared with 3 million tons). In the Dnepropetrovsk district, the second large center of the Ukrainian metallurgical industry, total production at this time was still less: 20 thousand tons of steel, 11 thousand tons of rolled steel, 5 thousand tons of cast steel, and no pig iron at all, although 3 blast furnaces, 13 open hearth furnaces and 17 rolling mills had been put in working order.¹⁶ This lag in production, as compared with the rate at which equipment is being restored, must be ascribed primarily to two causes: lack of high-grade coal, of which mention has already been made, and the shortage in iron ore. As a matter of fact, the iron ore mines of Krivoy Rog were in no better situation than the coal mines of the Donbas, and the total production of iron ore during the first year after the liberation reached only 500 thousand tons¹⁷ in place of the almost 18 million tons of the last year before the war. The

¹⁴*Pravda*, November 15, 1943.

¹⁵*Pravda*, September 8, 1944.

¹⁶*Pravda*, September 15, 1944.

¹⁷*Pravda*, October 27, 1944.

other factor which affects the production of both ferrous metals and coal is the slow revival of power plants. A very long time will elapse, for instance, before the famous Dnieprostroy is put back in operation.

VI

All that is now being done through necessity bears the stamp of emergency. The policy is dictated by the available means and by the need of achieving quick results, often without regard to technical and economic expediency. Herein lies the profound difference between the present-day reconstruction and that of the postwar period. In the latter, the task of restoration, in the narrow sense of the word, undoubtedly will be subordinated to the broader task of technical reorganization. Detrimental as the wartime destruction of industry is, it can be made a starting point for industrial progress if in the process of reconstruction the industry is reorganized in accordance with the latest technical developments. This is what happened to the French metallurgical industry after the First World War. After it was restored, it proved to be technically more advanced than that of England, which had not suffered destruction during the war.

It is obvious that the Soviet government is making plans for such a large-scale postwar reorganization. It is also clear that in the process of this reorganization, not all that has been destroyed will necessarily be rebuilt. It has already been announced that, as a rule, the evacuated industrial establishments will remain in their new homes, which does not exclude, of course, the possibility that whenever economically expedient, new ones will be built on their old sites. Thus the post-war economic reconstruction will be greatly influenced by the process of the geographical relocation of industry. This process had begun already before the war, but the war supplied a powerful stimulus to its further development.

The Revival of Liberated Cities in the Soviet Union

By VERA ALEXANDROVA

THE exact number of Russian cities which were damaged by the war has not been published. The Chief of the Committee on Architecture of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., Shkvarikov, gives in *Izvestiya*¹ only the figures concerning the R.S.F.S.R. On its territory, 195 cities have passed through German occupation; among this number are 135 medium-sized and small towns and 60 large cities. The degree of destruction varies. Cities like Istra, Smolensk, Stalingrad were razed almost to the ground. In Orel, Kursk, Kaluga, Voronezh, the central parts of the cities suffered particularly heavy damage. To these figures must be added a great number of demolished cities and towns of the Ukraine, White Russia, Crimea, and some cities of Northern Caucasus.

The Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian Republic, Nikita Khrushchov, said in his March 1, 1944, report to the Session of the Supreme Council that in such cities as Stalino in the Donets basin, Poltava, or Chernigov the destruction embraced two thirds of the total dwelling-space. Minsk, the capital of White Russia, was demolished like Stalingrad.

The dry figures of destruction are unable to reveal the whole tragic reality. On the eve of the third anniversary of the Soviet-German war, the correspondent of *Izvestiya*, Kriger, visited Stalingrad. One and a half years had passed since the defeat there of General von Paulus. But Kriger had difficulty in recognizing the city: "All its buildings were burned and destroyed. The stone frame work of Stalingrad is ghostly. Through the holes and fissures everywhere you see the sky translucent, the floating clouds, birds flying over the Volga. The rays of the setting sun reflected on the bare layers of

¹June 17, 1944.

bricks and mortar make the whole city appear rosy and light, gleaming with a cold flame of memories." One of the foreigners who had the chance to visit this city said to its head, the Secretary of the District Committee, Chuyanov: "You are now the king of ruins." In fact, the city counts 48,200 destroyed buildings.

The same terrible picture confronted Tatiana Tess, the correspondent of *Izvestiya*, in the city of Minsk: "One who sees Minsk now at night will remember it for the rest of his life. By day the clement sun revives the ruins a little. But there comes a time when night sets in, and you are standing on the main street. The uncovered sorrow of stones, demolished walls, dead hearths cries out to you. Against the sky are traced the torn edges, angles, and zigzags—the whole evil gothic of destruction. From the broken windows a pale moonlight floats, stars shimmer through doors and porches. The silence of a great disaster reposes upon the whole city."²

In the sketch, "On the Old Smolensk Road," Konstantin Simonov remarks that the fleeing Germans made of the city of Vyazma such a wreckage as even they had not succeeded in doing to any other city: "We are standing on one of its outskirts and we can see through it to the snowy fields on the other side. The whole city can be seen through, because it does not exist any more, it has ceased to exist now as a city."

The city of Kalinin (former Tver), before the war one of the most beautiful old Russian cities, has undergone heavy destruction. The city was rich in creations of the famous architect of the eighteenth century, Matvei Kazakov. "The Germans remained here only for two months, but after their departure the city looks as if it has suffered from a disastrous earthquake." Not only the famous palaces were destroyed, but all the one and two-story houses on the other side of the Volga, all of which were of great historical value. All that is now left of them are a few burned and ramshackle walls, floors and roofs turned to ashes, a shapeless mass of bricks.³

The picture of the ruined cities, which has been painted by correspondents, writers, and eyewitnesses, cannot be portrayed fully even in a large book. "The evil gothic of destruction"

²*Izvestiya*, August 6, 1944.

³V. Podklyuchnikov, "In the City of Kazakov," *Literatura i Iskusstvo*, May 9, 1942.

everywhere appears almost the same. The atmosphere of ruined cities and towns is well rendered in a small poem "Report From the Front" by Alexander Tvardovsky, who, as war-correspondent, has seen many cities and places ruined by the war:

"Only two years or full two hundred,
Brutal, wretched, ruinous years—
What now remains of this our city
Is neither town nor settlement.

Smoke issues from a cellar's gap,
A choked lane leads to a broken trench.
Only two years. Life must start anew
From fire, water, and fagot of wood."

Thousands on thousands of people of the liberated cities who had endured all the ordeals of the occupation, together with the refugees who returned to their demolished homes, are now facing a primeval standard of life. But they have not lost their grim courage. It is not by chance that a new proverb has become popular: "The eyes are frightened, but the hands are doing."

The architect Alabian, who as the head of a special commission was sent to make a report about the cities of the Moscow district, writes: "On both sides of the Mozhaisk road stood the burnt and destroyed houses. And then suddenly I caught sight among the ruins of an unforgettable picture: a boy of twelve, little girls, and some old men and women busy building a house, using for that purpose scorched boards and beams. It seemed to me symbolic that after all they had endured these children and old people, at the very moment of the enemy's departure, should be able to gather the energy for constructive work."⁴

The three Soviet painters, collectively known as Kukryniksy, towards the end of 1943, made a tour of the destroyed cities. Their way led them along the roads of the war, through Tula, Mtsensk, Orel, Kursk to Kiev. Ruins, fragments of stoves, destroyed bridges—all that vividly reminded them of "the bitterness of defeat." But at the same time they could glimpse

⁴"The Cities Revive from Their Ashes," *Literatura i Iskusstvo*, January 1, 1944.

the first signs of revival. They noticed on a post fastened to a destroyed German tank the inscription "Orel." The whole city was resounding "with the ring of axes and the squeak of hand-saws. They build, they mend, they reconstruct."

Not for nothing does an old Russian proverb say: "When a village sighs, a wind arises." Now, a year after their liberation, the efforts of millions of homeless people are merging into a river of reconstruction.

Here is the picture of the same city of Orel on the day of the first anniversary of its liberation: "Tidy, well swept streets, carefully white-washed and restored dwellings, new bridges still smelling of fresh-sawed wood; thousands of young trees and bushes of honeysuckle are planted along the street." The achievements of this city are mostly due to the self-sacrifice of its population. Housewives, become masons, plasterers, teachers, technicians, workers, did not only hunt for raw material but built out of the ruins new schools, hospitals, factories. Some 895 volunteer brigades were at work in the city.⁵

Even more striking is the experience of Kursk. In the first weeks after liberation, in February 1943, "Street committees" were organized, at the head of almost all of which were housewives. They formed many volunteer brigades.

Kursk and Orel are not exceptions. The initiative of the population in the restoration of the destroyed cities is perhaps the most characteristic feature in the whole picture of their revival.

From the beginning, Soviet officials tried to correlate the reconstruction of dwellings and public buildings with the restoration of factories. The whole atmosphere of the conditions of life and work is shown with particular vividness in a report from Stalingrad: "Side by side with an almost 'normal' two-story house is a hut built from all kind of tin-plate remnants. Nearby, under the open sky, stands a stove with a long chimney; on the stove is placed a soldier's helmet to serve as a kettle. The basis of a household—the stove—survived, and at its side has risen a prototype of a human dwelling." These primitive life conditions could not hinder the work of the rebuilding of the famous tractor plant of Stalingrad. In sixteen months, 5 thousand cars of iron debris were brought away

⁵*Izvestiya*, August 6, 1944.

from the area of this plant, and 12-15 thousand cars more remained to be removed. Nevertheless, in June 1944, the plant could partly resume its work, concentrating first of all on the restoration of wrecked tanks. Since August 1944, the plant has even begun the production of tractors.⁶

Of great interest are the reports showing the results of one year of this hard work. According to the article of Selivanov, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kharkov City Soviet, Kharkov, at the end of the first year of its liberation, "is rebuilt," many of the workshops of its gigantic plants are already working. Life has returned to the schools, institutes, laboratories, and theaters. For the anniversary of the October Revolution the population completed the construction of a new "Merchant Bridge," set in motion the destroyed water-supply in Kochetok, providing water from the Northern Donets river. At the same time, the restoration of the most beautiful building in the city, the House of the State Industry, took place.⁷

Great seem to be the achievements of the first year of reconstruction in Kiev. Some 242 industrial enterprises are restored, 200 handicraft cooperative shops are functioning, 700 trade enterprises, 362 restaurants, 9 hospitals, 18 high schools, 8 technical and 90 primary schools. More than a quarter of the dwelling space has been restored by the efforts of the population. The pride of the people of Kiev is the clearing of Kreshchatik—the main avenue of the city, on which all buildings were blown up by the Germans before their retreat. Help for the rebuilding of the city came from several cities of the Soviet Union—Moscow, Chelyabinsk, Sverdlovsk, Tashkent sent tools, parts of machines, and various building materials. But the need of materials is still great; brigades of volunteers organized among the population spent much time in searching in the ruins for bricks and remnants of wood and metal to be used for reconstruction.⁸

The results of the reconstruction of Odessa, which was liberated later than Kiev, are more modest. A correspondent of *Trud* who visited the city on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of its founding states that the retreating enemy

⁶*Pravda*, August 27, 1944.

⁷*Izvestiya*, October 31, 1944.

⁸*Trud*, November 5, 1944.

left the population without water, light, or bread. Some 2290 buildings were burnt or blown up, among them the main post-office. Reconstruction began some days after the liberation. By September 1944, already partly functioning were the street cars, one bread-factory, a few miles of the destroyed water and canalization pipes. Meanwhile, 30 artesian wells provided the water for the population.⁹

In Smolensk things go more slowly: "No one earthquake could bring to Smolensk such a disaster as have the Fascist robbers. Even now, more than a year after its liberation, the city depresses every observer with the terrible spectacle of its ruins. One who comes, let us say, at the end of October 1944, to Smolensk, at first glance does not realize that there is a city because it simply does not exist." But later on, walking about, one becomes aware of some signs of life: "Here, for example, is a house, without doors, its roof crushed, its joists and lintels hanging loose. . . . The observer asks himself, where can a place be found for a human being? But from the carefully puttied small windows of the cellar stick out smoking black pipes—obviously people are still living there. Quite close, on a vast plot, among crushed stones and wild bushy weeds, a new hut arises. It is built from burnt bricks, and its owner has covered the hut with burnt tin-plates and has even succeeded in painting the window frames a fresh and strident blue. Farther, in a windowless two-story dwelling, one can hear a gay knocking, floors are being laid down and window-frames knocked together."¹⁰

The slow tempo of the reconstruction in Smolensk, as in many other places, can be easily explained by the extreme scarcity of men and materials. "Not everybody—observes the same writer—is able to unbind the knot in which the local contradictions are tied up." One needs people to rebuild a city. But people must live somewhere, therefore dwellings must be provided, a whole city of dwellings, with water, and heat, and light. Not long ago, Goltz, a member of the Academy of Architecture, suggested for public discussion his project for the rebuilding of Smolensk. It now has been accepted. The architectural nucleus of the new Smolensk, according to this

⁹*Trud*, September 2, 1944.

¹⁰Mikhail Nikitin, "One Year After," *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, November 7, 1944.

project, will be the citadel of the restored old Kremlin, and around it is planned a large park-zone. In the center of the park-belt will be situated the Garden of Glinka (the great Russian musician, Glinka, was a native of Smolensk). A vast museum of the Great Fatherland War is planned, too. The tower of this museum on the old Trubetzkoj Wall will mark the start of a large main avenue of the city.

In this connection it is necessary to give some attention to a very important aspect of the whole reconstruction work. The gigantic task which the country confronts, as a result of its no less gigantic destruction, has aroused the enthusiasm of Russian architects. As soon as the Red Army started the offensive and succeeded in liberating the first cities, loud and animated discussion took place dealing with the future tasks of the revival of the destroyed cities.

The interest in modern architecture in the prewar years led to a certain neglect of the old Russian architecture. The war with its tremendous destruction of the cultural treasures of the country has awakened among artists, writers, and architects a deep feeling for Russian culture and especially for Russian art.

D. Arkin, after having enumerated all the damaged historical monuments, writes: "Russia created in its past a great architecture. Like Russian literature and Russian music, Russian architecture has a universal value. The national originality of Russian architecture consists in the fact, that it never was limited by local motives and styles; so Russian architecture forms a necessary link in the chain of world architecture." According to Arkin, the road from classical Greece and Rome through Byzantium to Kievan Russia led to the development of the classical tradition on a completely new and fresh soil. The most striking feature of Russian architecture has always been "the feeling for the ensemble," a vivid architectural reaction to the landscape and a definite "urban feeling." This is particularly sharply brought out in the old Russian Kremlins, monasteries, and in modern times, in the creation of Petersburg (Leningrad).¹¹

The new appreciation of Russian art is not only characteris-

¹¹D. Arkin, "Russian Architecture Is Immortal," *Literatura i Iskusstvo*, May, 1942.

tic of a small group of artists and specialists, but seems to be spreading among larger layers of the population. It is well shown in the sketch of Konstantin Fedin "Rendezvous with Leningrad." On his trip there, Fedin made the acquaintance of a young woman who, before the war, was the chief curator of the palaces of Peterhof which after the Revolution were transformed into museums. Peterhof fell to the Germans. But as soon as it was liberated, this woman, neglecting all difficulties, went afoot to Peterhof. She came there realizing that the Peterhof she once knew existed now only in her memory: before her were ruins. Nevertheless, she was convinced that after the war the famous palaces would be restored. And she was already organizing, collecting every little thing with which the future restorers could begin their work. "Like bees," said she, "we shall collect our palaces from the very dust."¹²

The successes of the Red Army enabled the architects to pass from theoretical discussions to practical work. The new spirit of the architects is clearly imprinted on many of the new projects. The well-known architect Iofan wrote recently: "It is necessary to find again the image of every city which is to be rebuilt, and to preserve its original architectural face." In this work both the rich experience of the great epochs of the past, and the experience of modern architecture must be applied. Deep importance must be attached to the "architectural" connection of the city with the surrounding land. The natural topography must be used in the composition of the whole city. Cities must be modelled much as "our old Russian cities were created." The situation of the city along a river or on a sea-shore must determine its planning. In the meantime, Iofan suggests that one should "care for and cherish in any city its architectural legacy if its monuments represent any artistic value."¹³

Similar are the thoughts of another famous architect, Shchusev. A special committee dealing with the problems of architecture has recently been created by the Council of People's Commissars of the Soviet Union. Together with the Academy of Architecture, they are preparing thousands of architects and engineers for the coming task. The reconstruc-

¹²*Novyi Mir*, No. 4/5, 1944.

¹³"The Reconstruction of Our Cities," *Izvestiya*, September 12, 1944.

tion of the cities cannot be undertaken mechanically and limited to the task of restoration. In each case it will depend upon the degree of destruction, the character of the city, and its significance. In place of cities which have been destroyed to the ground, like Istra, completely new cities must be erected. The new Istra will be a city of sanatoriums and nursing-homes for the people of Moscow. In the reconstruction of Novgorod, the artistic value of its historical monuments and buildings must be considered. The project for the rebuilding of this city is based on the reconstruction of the ancient Kremlin which will influence the architecture of the whole. In the capital of White Russia, Minsk, it is planned to create a new center in place of the demolished one, with a magnificent park "like the Tuilleries in Paris."

Great attention is devoted to the project of the reconstruction of Stalingrad, which must become "the city of Russian glory." Along the Volga river, in place of the completely destroyed buildings, a new boulevard with a monument to the liberators of Stalingrad is to be created. This boulevard will lead to the Arc of Triumph with an Alley of Heroes of the Fatherland War, ending with a big monument to Stalin. On Victory Square will be erected the State Theater. In Kiev, according to Shchusev, the main attention is to be concentrated on the reconstruction of its central avenue, the famous Kreshchatik. The whole street will be enlarged. A contest was recently arranged for projects for the building of eighty six-story edifices for the Kreshchatik Avenue. In this contest, twenty of the best known architects of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and Odessa took part. Kreshchatik will now have an outlet to the Dnieper river.¹⁴

A complete new city is planned in place of the destroyed seaport of Novorossiisk. Iofan, who visited this city on the first anniversary of its liberation, wrote in *Izvestiya*: "The city has been heavily damaged. In its rebuilding the defects of its former planning must be avoided. The former Novorossiisk was cut off from the Black Sea by streets with ugly warehouses. Due to this the sea seems to have been left out. The future city is planned for a population of one hundred and fifty thousands.

¹⁴Shchusev, "The Cities Revive" in *Sovetskoe Iskusstvo*, November 7, 1944.

It will include the sea with all its splendour of color and perspective. The whole city will turn its face to the sea."¹⁵

Some of these beautiful and luxurious projects are in large part "music of the future." For the time being, the main task of the rebuilding of the cities is concentrated on the reconstruction of dwellings, water-supply, factories. But, although architecture is the most silent of the arts, many of the new projects speak loudly of the awakened love for architectural beauty in the Soviet Union of today.

¹⁵*Izvestiya*, October 7, 1944.

The Soviet School Experiment*

By N. S. TIMASHEFF

WHEN the Communists took over Russia, they inherited a school system which needed both quantitative expansion and substantial reform.¹ Nevertheless, it was well qualified to serve the basic end of education, that of conveying to the young generation theoretical and practical knowledge necessary for the preservation and advance of the nation's culture.

Very definitely, however, this was a school system deeply ingrained in the "bourgeois" type of civilization, and the Communists could not be satisfied with submitting it merely to partial reform. It was necessary to destroy the old school system altogether and to create a new one which would serve the main ends of the Revolution. Theoretically, destruction and reconstruction ought to have taken place simultaneously. But, in the course of the first few years after the Revolution, the attention of the new leaders was focussed on subjects of greater importance than school reform. Moreover, the economic collapse of the years of War Communism made any constructive work almost impossible. It was only in 1923 that the real school experiment could begin, and it lasted up to 1931, when its nefarious effects were recognized by the new rulers themselves. After a few years of indecision and attempts at partial reform, a complete retreat began in 1934, which, in the course of ten years, brought the school system of the Soviet Union to a state amazingly resembling that which had been in force in 1917 and, still more amazingly, led to a partial restoration of old practices and devices abandoned in Russia some time before the Revolution.

*The present article is a part of the author's forthcoming book, *The Great Retreat: Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia*, to be published by E. P. Dutton & Co. [Ed.]

¹The need of expansion was taken care of by the ten-year plan of education on the basis of the law of May 3, 1908. A series of well thought out reforms were envisaged in 1915-16 by the Ministry of Education under Count Paul Ignatief (cf. P. Malevski-Malevich, *Russia-USSR*, 1933, pp. 656 and 659-60).

II

The destruction of the old school system was carried out in the guise of a bold and far-reaching educational reform. The Educational Act of October 16, 1918, replaced the complicated school system of old Russia by a "unified polytechnical school," with nine (later ten) grades.² No home work was permitted, examinations were abolished, as well as any kind of punishment. Overnight, co-education was introduced on all levels. The labor principle was stressed, and the schools were transformed into a preparatory stage for the productive work in which the pupils were to engage after graduation. The administration of the schools was entrusted to "school collectives" composed of all the teachers, pupils, and employees.

As a result, the schools became revolutionary clubs for young people, while their basic function, that of inculcating knowledge, was almost entirely neglected. As material conditions were desperate, school attendance substantially decreased. The teachers were ill paid, cases of abject poverty, mass sickness, and even prostitution were reported among them.³ The labor principle degenerated into imposing purely mechanical tasks on the pupils, such, for instance, as the carrying of fuel from the yard to the stoves.

The reform of elementary and high schools was accompanied by a sweeping university reform. The decree of August 8, 1918, permitted every boy or girl over the age of sixteen to enroll in a university, irrespective of their academic background. Another decree of October 8, 1918, aimed at "blowing up" the universities from within. This decree proclaimed (1) the abolition of academic grades,⁴ and (2) the introduction into the university councils of all faculty instructors, in the hope that these would be more inclined than the professors to carry out reforms in the Communist style. In 1920 a reform of the academic curriculum was carried out, based on the distorted information as to American educational patterns, then in vogue among those in power. The liberal phase of

²In later years, the four lower grades began to be opposed to the upper six grades as elementary school to secondary school.

³These facts were told at the Tenth Congress of the Soviets in December 1922, by the People's Commissar of Education.

⁴This permitted the appointment to faculties of persons with little training in science, but of high loyalty to the régime.

education was neglected; emphasis was laid on strict specialization, mainly in the technical sciences. The result was the same as in the case of the "unified school": teaching in the true sense of the word almost stopped, and, in consequence, the training of specialists for all kinds of learned professions ceased likewise.

III

About 1923, the general improvement of conditions in the country due to the New Economic Policy permitted the Communist government to start the Great Experiment in the field of education. In the course of this period substantial quantitative achievements were made. While, in 1923, 6.8 million children were registered in elementary schools and 0.6 million in high schools, ten years later 18.2 millions were enrolled in the former and 3.6 millions in the latter. But these quantitative achievements were more than offset by the deterioration in the quality of teaching.⁵

The aim of the experiment was clear: the school was to be a weapon in the hands of the workers preparing fighters for the realization of the ideals of the working class.⁶ But what were the appropriate means to bring this about? On this question the Communists had no ideas of their own. They therefore decided to imitate the most radical patterns they could find in Europe and America, without regard to the fact that the new ideas were applied there only in a few "progressive" and very expensive schools. Since information about foreign progressive education was limited, Soviet policies changed so frequently and were so contradictory, that the teachers had no opportunity to adjust themselves to each of the successive new sets of rules.

In the course of the experiment, the old system, providing for regular periods of study, the division of pupils into classes, and guidance by teachers, was abolished. The teaching of subject matter was replaced by "projects," even the three R's were taught on that basis. The "projects" were, naturally, used to inculcate the Marxist doctrine in the minds of the

⁵For the quantitative aspect of the advance in elementary education of the U.S.S.R. see my paper "Overcoming Illiteracy," *The Russian Review*, vol. 2, No. 1.

⁶*Na putyakh k novoi shkole*, 1923, No. 2, p. 14.

pupils. As revealed in 1934,⁷ in Moscow, children nine or ten years old had to discuss planned economy, including such questions as the reasons for developing heavy industry ahead of the light industry. In Samara, the resolutions of Party congresses, written in the dull and clumsy language typical of all the official documents, were used to exemplify the rules on the participle. The province of Ivanovo distinguished itself by the introduction of "political contests" in the course of which insidious questions on current politics were asked. At the same time, to make instruction easier, special pamphlets were published containing all the necessary information. This permitted the teachers to greatly simplify the procedure; they no longer had to formulate the question, but could just ask: what is the reply to, say, question four of the second chapter? When, in 1934, these educational methods finally were discontinued, a group of teachers were moved to write: "We have lived to see the great day. Now we shall no longer be forced to torture ourselves and the children by demanding that they memorize sociological schemes which they cannot understand. What have we done? We have taught them everything except facts."

Simultaneously with the experimentation in the lower and middle grades of the school system, sweeping changes took place in the universities and other institutions of higher learning. In old Russia, since 1905, these institutions enjoyed a degree of autonomy almost unknown in other civilized countries.⁸ In the fall of 1922 this autonomy was completely abolished. A board of directors was placed at the head of every institution, all appointed by the Commissariat of Education. Academic teaching was naturally coordinated with the general situation. In 1922, a National Council of Science was created, consisting mainly of high party officials. Very soon it began to furnish its own detailed programs of lectures to be delivered by the professors. Students belonging to the

⁷Because of the peculiar political structure of the U.S.S.R., information about educational shortcomings became available many years later, when, in the opinion of the leaders, these shortcomings had been overcome.

⁸The universities were state institutions, and the state treasury paid the salaries of the staff. But the professors formed an autonomous body, the University Council, which elected the President (Rector) and the Deans of the Faculties or divisions, as well as new members of the staff when positions were open.

Communist cells had the duty of checking the conformity of these lectures with the prescribed programs. Naturally, the study of the Marxist doctrine was imposed on all students. On the other hand, quite a few subjects of study were dropped. Those faculties or divisions of the universities in which, before the start of the experiment, liberal education had survived, disappeared. The class principle was applied to the selection of students. The number of students to be registered in each institution was fixed, and preference was given to graduates of "Labor Faculties," special institutions where young workers and "poor peasants" were given preparatory training for academic studies. Some preparation was required to enter these schools, but the requirements were low and could not be insisted upon, since few qualified workers and peasants were available. Finally, an attempt was made to give a definitely proletarian shape to university studies. In 1928, the principle of "uninterrupted practice" was introduced: every student had to spend, alternately, two weeks at a university and one week at a factory. This was an unfortunate idea, since the heads of the industrial units did not know what to do with this intermittent student labor. Instead of introducing them to the technological processes, they used them as unskilled labor and assigned them to the transportation of loads, sweeping floors, standing watch at night, etc.

IV

The result of the Great Experiment in education was a cultural catastrophe. This fact has been established beyond doubt by numerous surveys carried out in the first half of the thirties. According to these surveys, candidates for enrollment in institutions of higher learning displayed a lack of command of the Russian language, poor reading knowledge, the tendency to use stereotyped and unfounded generalizations. The evil proved to be a tenacious one. In 1938, the following statement was made: "In a number of schools there is a considerable amount of semi-literate children. Even in Moscow many children do not have a command of the Russian language."⁹

This situation was the more serious as the majority of the young teachers had graduated from Soviet schools where they

⁹ *Uchitelskaya Gazeta*, May 25, 1938.

had not learned much and therefore had not much to communicate to their pupils. Here are a few examples.

In 1936, a "pact of socialist emulation" was signed between two teachers' schools. The school whose students would come nearest to the goal of faultless spelling would be the winner. The official journal of the Commissariat of Education reproduced, without corrections, the challenge and the acceptance. Each of the letters contained no more than a few hundred words, and, although the rules of Russian spelling after the reform of 1917¹⁰ are rather simple, there were one hundred and thirty two mistakes in the first letter, and one hundred and fifty six mistakes in the second.¹¹

Naturally, the young teachers knew nothing about history. "This fall," wrote the same journal, "Soviet children were especially eager to return to school. They knew that a new subject was to be taught, and a fascinating one, Russian history. They were eager to learn who were the mysterious Varangians, what were the deeds of Rurik, Vladimir, and the other princes. Alas, they were disappointed, because the teachers could not satisfy their curiosity and, instead of giving them facts, talked in terms of vague sociological generalizations."

These poorly trained teachers had to face in their classes pupils who lacked any idea of order and discipline. Here is a letter from a girl who had just graduated from high school and was offered a teacher's position. "There is no poorer profession than that of a teacher. In classrooms there is such a smell that one always has a headache. It is so noisy that the teacher has to shout all the time. Hooligans among the pupils disorganize the class. No, thank you." A newspaper wrote: "Because of poor discipline many periods of study are entirely wasted. Larcenies in schools are frequent. In front of the school buildings the pupils fight and make a terrible noise. Not knowing what to do with rebellious pupils, the principals and the teachers call the police and have them arrested and punished."¹²

Equally serious was the fact that because of the completely senseless curriculum the interest of the pupils was not aroused.

¹⁰Carried out by the Provisional Government.

¹¹Za kommunisticheskoe prosvetshchenie, May 23, 1934; July 2, 1935; Jan. 1, 1936.

¹²Vechernyaya Krasnaya Gazeta, September 9, 1935.

In April 1934, the Central Committee of the Communist Party recognized that "political education" which, in the course of the Experiment, had been paramount, was a complete failure. It was boring, and it destroyed the children's interest even in such social phenomena as they were able to understand.

V

The necessity to stop the school experiment was understood by the Communist leaders when they saw that the program of industrialization could no longer be pushed forward because of the lack of adequately trained young specialists or even generally educated persons. Already in 1931 and 1932 partial reforms were tried. A resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of September 5, 1931, warned the professors and teachers against the survival of pre-revolutionary educational methods, and also against the indiscriminate application of the so-called "progressive" methods. The resolution acknowledged that the Soviet school did not give its graduates sufficient preparation for further study. To meet the demands of the Communist leaders, the Commissariat of Education introduced a new curriculum: history as a special subject reappeared; teaching of the "social sciences": i.e. the Marxist doctrine, was curtailed, as was also the compulsory "social activity" of the pupils. The schools were separated from production and steered towards their natural function, that of teaching. As usual, a number of persons who had been active in the educational system prior to this reform were declared to be subversive deviators from the Party line and were treated accordingly. The center of the pedagogical thought of the previous period, the Institute of Marxist Pedagogy, was disbanded.

On August 25, 1932, the movement was continued by another resolution of the Central Committee. Some more items of "progressive education" were abolished. The class period was restored in its dignity of the basic unit of teaching. Principals were ordered to elaborate definite schedules and to insist on their application. Teachers were ordered to teach their subjects systematically. These were very natural demands indeed. But does not the necessity of emphasizing

them say more than volumes about the state of the schools before their formulation?

Important changes took place also in institutions of higher learning. The decree of September 19, 1932, restored the authority of the professors; they, and no longer the Communist cells, were to give marks to the students. Furthermore, it was ordered that only those sufficiently prepared and who had passed the entrance examinations were to be registered as students; that lectures were to be given regularly and according to schedule; that such novelties as the "brigade method" in examinations be abolished;¹³ that theses be written by candidates for degrees; that students be relieved from too much social activity; that, when selecting young men to be trained for professorial positions, academic achievements, and no longer zeal in Communist propaganda, be the decisive factor. These were sweeping changes indeed, but still in the framework of the Great Experiment. The methods of teaching were improved, but what the student was to be taught still continued to be determined by the Communist doctrine. That no departure from fundamentals was envisaged may be derived from the fact that the resolution of 1931 emphasized the importance of purely Communist education in schools and enjoined the local Party committees to closely supervise the school system and especially the teaching of social sciences. The general spirit of the time was not yet favorable to drastic change. In 1933, the People's Commissar for Education acknowledged that the "leftist deviation" in school had been ingrained more deeply in the system of education than first assumed. He enjoined the educators to eliminate the anti-Leninist idea that the school was withering away together with the state.¹⁴

VI

It was only in 1934 and later, when almost all phases of social and cultural life were submitted to rapid change, away from the Communist blueprint and back to the traditional values, that the school reform gained momentum. The aim of the reform was obvious: to bring back order and to give sensible

¹³The method consisted in examining the students in groups (brigades), each member of the group being permitted to answer the questions for the whole group.

¹⁴Quoted from a speech of the People's Commissar of Education, April 21, 1933.

shape to the school curriculum. What were, however, the specific order and curriculum to be adopted? In this regard the Communist leaders displayed the same lack of imagination and creative ability as in the beginning of their school experiment. Then, they used the model of "progressive education" as the most radical and, it seemed, the most revolutionary departure from historical tradition. This time, they chose for model the school of Imperial Russia, probably for the simple reason that, having studied in it themselves, they knew that in that school there was order and that the curriculum (which was not very different from the French or the German) was rather sensible. Revolutionary diatribes against the old school became now out of place; they had served their purpose when the Revolution had been in its infancy; now that it had come of age they became a nuisance.

To bring back order, measures initiated in 1931 and 1932 were reinforced and expanded. In the fall of 1934, "stabilized teaching plans and programs" were imposed on elementary and secondary schools, stating how many hours a week should be spent in each class for each subject and what particular topics should be taught. In January 1935, new rules on pupils self-government were issued. Self-government was entirely abolished in the four lower grades. Where it remained, its purpose was defined as that of helping the teachers to raise the level of school work and discipline. In institutions for higher learning, the Young Communist organizations, whose activity had made real study impossible, were prohibited from interfering with the orders of the administration and were given the task of improving the conditions of study. In May 1935, yearly examinations were revived, and the passing from one grade to another was made dependent on success at these examinations. Early in the twentieth century, first the reduction in number of such examinations and then their complete abolition, had been hailed in Russia as a significant victory of progressive ideas in education. Thus, in this respect, the new Soviet school order went back to the late nineteenth century.

The most conspicuous item, however, was the restoration of the uniform, for boys and girls alike, both in elementary and secondary schools. This was even more than returning to "the good old days" since, in Imperial Russia, uniforms were unknown on the elementary level.

How responsive were the school authorities to this aspect of the retreat may be seen from the following facts. In September 1935, the journal of the Commissariat of Education gave a preview of the uniform to be introduced at some later date. Immediately people began discussing—not whether uniforms were desirable, but whether "electric blue," chosen for the girls in secondary schools, would be becoming; some people thought that this would do very well for girls with rosy cheeks but would not be suitable at all for the pale ones. A few days later it was learned that in many places the local authorities had introduced uniforms of their own invention, without waiting for the final order. The center rebuked the overzealous principals and explained that uniforms could be introduced only gradually.¹⁵ In 1944, in relation to girls, the reform was accentuated: pigtails became the officially recommended style of hair dressing.¹⁶

It was more difficult, however, to restore discipline. "In accordance with Stalin's personal desire," experienced Communist leaders were sent to the schools of the great cities where discipline was lowest. They were to instill into the minds of the pupils that they had to be polite and respect the authority of the teachers.¹⁷ The teachers were ordered to supervise the conduct of the pupils and to help them get rid of such habits as keeping their hats on in class or jamming the principal into a corner. Budennyi, then a great man, was asked to help. In a letter, published in December 1935, he advised the pupils to be quiet in class, to pay attention to the teachers, and to prepare carefully their home work; they should spend their leisure time on "physical culture," advice becoming a military leader. Only a few years earlier, however, he would have added some advice about studying the Communist doctrine. It was symptomatic that he did not.

All these measures met with partial success only. This is beyond doubt, since, in October 1943, the Commissar of Education said: "Much remains to be done as to discipline. The slightest sign of rudeness, of disrespect towards elders must be

¹⁵*Izvestiya*, September 11 and 13, 1935.

¹⁶*Izvestiya*, January 8, 1944.

¹⁷*Pravda*, October 30, 1935.

severely dealt with. There is still some reluctance to accept a strong attitude towards laziness and hooliganism."¹⁸

In the course of the war, an additional step was taken towards the restoration of the pre-revolutionary school order. This was the abandonment of co-education, introduced at the beginning of the Revolution and highly praised at that time as one of the most significant steps away from bourgeois society, where the girls are allegedly trained to become housekeepers or mistresses of men "owning" them. The movement away from co-education started in Moscow in 1942-43, and, in the fall of 1943, became general. Articles published about that time explained that experience with co-education had shown that there were physiological and psychological reasons against it, namely the different mental and physical development of boys and girls. Another objection was based on the inevitable division of labor between men and women. A boy must be prepared for service in the Red Army, but a girl is essentially a future mother and must know how to look after her children and how to bring them up. In the course of the academic year 1944-45, different programs of study for boys and girls were introduced, the boys specializing in technical subjects, while the girls were to be trained in pedagogy, handicrafts, domestic science, personal hygiene, and the care of children.¹⁹

VII

The change in the curriculum was the culminating point of a movement which started in 1934. In this respect the most important item was the abandonment of "political education." This was probably one of the greatest sacrifices made by the Communist leaders in the course of the momentous years 1934-39, when the nation was being prepared for the inevitable war. Very courageously, the leaders recognized the necessity of the step and acted accordingly. The curtailment of political education in elementary and secondary schools was effected through the resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of April 22 and 24, 1934. Political education was altogether abolished in the seven lower grades of the

¹⁸*Izvestiya*, August 18, 1943. *New York Times*, October 17, 1943.

¹⁹*Izvestiya*, August 8, 1943.

school. One hour a week was left in the eighth and ninth grades, and two hours in the tenth grade.

Simultaneously, social work in schools was once more curbed. Why should elementary school pupils be compelled to be members of auxiliary groups of "voluntary societies," such as Aid to the International Revolution, or Chemical and Aerial Warfare, or study such topics as the master plan for the reconstruction of Moscow? Such questions were posed by *Pravda*. Children should study well and spend their leisure time skating and skiing.²⁰ Such was the advice given. Budennyi's letter, quoted above, should be remembered in this context.

In institutions for higher learning a similar trend gained the upper hand, four years later. On November 15, 1938, the Central Committee of the Party decided to discontinue the separate teaching of dialectical materialism, Leninism, and the History of the Communist Party. Instead, the students should have one course in Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist Theory on the basis of the official *History of the Communist Party* edited by Stalin. The reform was drastic but still insufficient, since the students have been reported to find the new course tedious and to pay almost no attention to the lectures.²¹

The abandonment of political education gave room for the study of those subjects which had been neglected under the Communist Experiment, especially of the mother tongue, literature, history, geography, and foreign languages.

Relatively simple was the task of restoring the teaching of the mother tongue. If there are well-trained teachers and if there is reasonable order, the pupils must succeed after a few years of study. The two prerequisites were gradually being fulfilled. But this was a long process. Could not short cuts be found by directly appealing to the pupils? Actually, in 1934-36, the Commissar of Education used this method and exhorted the pupils to get rid of their illiteracy. The most insistent appeal was published in 1936. "Our government and Stalin personally," wrote the Commissar, "demand that only wholly literate pupils graduate from schools so that they will be able to continue their study in institutions of higher learning. Therefore, the pupils should make the utmost effort to acquire

²⁰*Pravda*, February 7, 1936.

²¹*Pravda*, April 26, 1939.

the art of correct spelling. Those who will not have mastered spelling will not be granted certificates of graduation." To help the pupils carry out this advice, the Commissar ordered that they be given "orthographic dictionaries," to be used in all kinds of compositions.²²

Much more difficult was the reorganization of the teaching of history, geography, and literature, because, in these subjects, political problems were involved. The task seemed so important that on May 16, 1934, two decrees were signed by Stalin for the Party and by Molotov for the Soviet government. One, ordered that history be taught according to chronological order, and that pupils be required to memorize the most important events with their dates as well as the names of the prominent actors on the historical scene. The other, ordered that the teaching of geography be resumed. Children should memorize the geographical names and gain a solid knowledge of the map. In addition, it was decreed that new textbooks be written and submitted for the approval of a special committee. On August 14, 1934, this committee, consisting of the highest dignitaries of the State, among them Stalin, published a criticism of the outlines of Histories of Russia submitted by the prospective authors. When, out of the competing drafts, one was selected and made the standard text, *Pravda* wrote: "To love one's great and free fatherland means first of all to know its past. For a Soviet pupil the textbooks on history must belong to the number of the most fascinating books. The tendency to discuss history according to sociological stereotypes has nothing in common with Marxism. The main thing demanded from a textbook on history is the same as that demanded from Soviet literature: it must be so clear and simple that the mass of the people can understand it."²³

There was also some trouble with the texts on geography and literature. The new text on literature by Florinsky and Trifonov was condemned since it repeated the old error of abstract treatment of the subject. In three texts on geography, published to fill the new requirements, a committee of experts discovered three hundred and eighty-five mistakes.²⁴

²²*Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie*, February 8, 1936.

²³*Pravda*, March 7, 1936.

²⁴*Krasnaya Nov*, 1936, No. 3. *Za kommunisticheskoe prosveshchenie*, December 12, 1936.

After many revisions, the goal as to textbooks was proclaimed to have been reached. Texts now used in Soviet schools can be characterized as systematic and clear, but rather dull. All novelties in the style of progressive education have been banished. On the basis of such texts, in combination with refresher courses for the teachers, the study of history and literature have been put on a rather solid foundation. There has been more trouble with the languages. In 1938, it was established that the orders as to their teaching had not been carried out, especially in relation to French and English, while German was taught in quite a few schools. The reason was that persons familiar with the Western languages were lacking. In consequence, only five percent of the students in institutions of higher learning had a reading knowledge of foreign languages.²⁵

In the universities the pre-revolutionary curriculum has also been partly restored. This was expressed in the fact that "Faculties" of History, Literature, Philosophy, and Law had been restored in those universities where this was feasible, but in many instances this proved to be beyond the range of possibility. Here, as in many other aspects of Soviet cultural life, a hard lesson was taught to the Communist reformers: a Faculty may be disbanded by affixing a signature to a sheet of paper, but no signature, exhortation, or order, is sufficient to resurrect a defunct cultural institution.

VIII

Somewhat outside the trends discussed so far, but definitely within the general framework of the "restoration" policy of the last decade, stands an additional measure of great importance. On October 2, 1940, a decree appeared, the preamble of which stated that "in conditions of increasing welfare, the interests of the socialist State and society demand that part of the expenses of public education be born by the toilers themselves." In consequence, education ceased to be free in the three upper grades of the "unified school" and in all institutions of higher learning. The newly established fees are rather high: 200 roubles a year in high school in Moscow, Leningrad, and the

²⁵*Izvestiya*, September 9, 1938.

capitals of the federated republics; 150 roubles elsewhere. In institutions of higher learning, the tuition fee was set at 300 to 400 roubles, even 500 roubles in schools of art, music, and drama. A number of students may be granted state subsidies; to earn them they must receive the mark "excellent" in two thirds of the subjects and "good" in the rest.

IX

In no field was reconstruction after years of destruction more difficult than in education. Let us, however, not forget the fact that, to a large extent, the educational chaos had been created by those very people who later on had to combat it. In no field, moreover, did the efforts to restore order and efficiency result in a greater approximation to the old structure than in education. With the passing away of free education and co-education, the last vestiges of "revolutionary achievements" have gone. Twenty-seven years after the Revolution, the internal order in schools is comparable not so much to the relatively liberal order of the early twentieth century as to that of the reactionary period of the eighties and nineties of the nineteenth century. Moreover, at the present time, the curriculum differs only slightly from that of Imperial Russia. Thus, for instance, the list of classic works to be read in Soviet schools almost completely coincides with that used in 1917, naturally with the addition of a few works written after that date. The main difference is that the study of Religion has been replaced by the study of the Marxist doctrine. But even this difference appears to be rather a similarity, if one considers that in Communist society the Marxist doctrine has taken the place of the dogma of the Orthodox Church.

The objection could still be raised that the scheme of the "unified school" permits a bright boy or girl to reach the summit of the educational system, whereas in old Russia, as in prewar France or Germany, the school system was so organized that graduates from elementary schools rarely continued their education, while boys and girls from well-to-do families enrolled directly in the lower classes of the secondary school, after a few years of home training. But the fees introduced in 1940 restored, in a new form, the pre-revolutionary barrier,

once more making secondary and higher education a privilege of the upper social groups.

The restoration of the old order and old curriculum were means to restoring the efficacy of the school system. These means were applied to a system which had been expanded and simultaneously permitted to deteriorate. When the results of the systematic efforts of the past decade will become fully effective, Russia will possess a school system meeting the normal educational requirements both quantitatively and qualitatively, though there will still be much room for improvement.

Book Reviews

HYDE, NINA VERHOVSKOY and FILLMORE HYDE. *Russia Then and Always*. New York, Coward-McCann, 1944. 331 pp. \$3.00.

NORMANO, J. F. *The Spirit of Russian Economics*. New York, John Day, 1945. 170 pp. \$2.00.

DOROSH, HARRY. *Russian Constitutionalism*. New York, Exposition Press, 1944. 127 pp. \$2.50.

The first of these volumes is an outline of Russian history of the historical essay variety. It attempts to give a broad general interpretation of the main phases of Russian historical development and, in particular, to connect Russia's past with her present. Well organized and equally well written, it will appeal to the general reader who will find in it much interesting information and much thought-provoking comment. The authors have a definite thesis to prove, and with commendable frankness they state it in their preface. Russia is the "heroine" of their story, and "where there is a heroine there must be villains." For their villains they chose the nations of Western Europe, and the whole story is written from the point of view of a supposedly fundamental opposition between Russia and Europe. In itself, such an approach, reminiscent of the old Slavophil doctrine, is perfectly legitimate. The meaning of Russian history has been debated at least for over one hundred years and in all probability will continue to be debated to the end of time. This is as it should be. The trouble begins when a general interpretation col-

lides with well-established facts, and the Hydes, as I see it, have not avoided the danger of such a collision.

Take their treatment of Russian political history, for instance. Starting from the premise that in contrast to Western Europe, where the struggle for power was the rule, in Russia the spirit of cooperation prevailed, they describe the Russian prince of the Kiev period as a mere "elected military leader"—a description that certainly does not fit most of the rulers of that period. Likewise, to state that "the Kiev system of princely succession saved Russia from innumerable feudal sorrows" is to ignore the frequent and bitter princely feuds in Kiev Russia which were among the factors that brought about its downfall. In the description of the process of unification of Russia under the leadership of Moscow, "voluntary submission" to Moscow is emphasized while such events as the bloody conquest of Novgorod and Tver are either minimized or ignored. The statement that the power of the Muscovite Tsar "as a personal ruler" was severely limited by the "traditional Slav ideas of the relations of ruler to the ruled" can not be supported by any historical evidence. One cannot maintain either that Ivan IV's "terribleness was not directed at the people" if one reads authentic contemporary accounts of how virtually all classes of the population, and not the boyars alone, suffered from the governmental terror. The relationship between the first Romanovs and the Zemsky Sobor is presented as a case of mutual will-

ingness to let the other side assume power. Actually, the new dynasty used the assistance of the Sobor so long as it needed it, and then dispensed with it when it felt sufficiently strong and established—just as the French monarchy dispensed with the Estates General in the days of Richelieu. The acute struggle for power in eighteenth century Russia, in which not individuals only but social groups were involved, is somewhat soft-pedalled, and the famous attempt to limit the sovereign's power at Empress Anne's accession in 1730 is not mentioned at all. The authors certainly have the right to condemn the constitutional régime introduced in Russia in 1905 as "alien" to the Russian tradition, but again their version of this political development is in conflict with facts. According to them, the first two Dumas were dissolved by the government "on the theory that the mass of Russians were not represented . . . and the election law was altered to increase the weight of the peasant vote." As a matter of fact, the new electoral law of 1907 drastically curtailed the peasant vote in favor of the landowners, in order to insure the election of a more conservative body.

The social history of Russia, and in particular the problem of the rise of serfdom, is dealt with in a similar vein. No sufficient weight is given either to the peasant indebtedness to the landlords—or to the effects of governmental policy, and the assertion is made that "the farmers themselves organized [into the *mir*] to try to stop the constant wandering and migration." The desperate struggle of the peasantry against serfdom virtually is ignored, and such events as the Razin and the Pugachev revolts are not even mentioned.

Furthermore, it certainly is not correct to say that, in contrast with Western Europe, "Russian serfdom was not a social but an economic blight" and that in Russia "there was no question of the peasant's lower human rating . . . until portions of the *dvorianstvo* became westernized." On the contrary, in Russia serfdom developed into downright slavery which it never did in the West, and it was under the influence of Western ideas that Radishchev wrote the first abolitionist tract in Russian literature.

Finally, Russia's foreign policy throughout the ages is presented as entirely devoid of any elements of aggression, imperialism, or colonial expansion, which on the contrary are declared to be the characteristic features of the policy of Western European states. Would it not be more in conformity with historical truth to admit that Russia's foreign policy, like that of every other nation in the world, has been (and still is) a compound of power politics and ideology? Certainly, it is difficult to see how, from the *moral* point of view, Russian imperial expansion differs from any other similar process in world's history. Coming to particulars, one can point out that the thesis of Catherine II's passive acquiescence in the partitions of Poland, with all the blame put on Frederick of Prussia, is no longer tenable in view of the results of modern investigations (see, for instance, R. H. Lord's *Second Partition of Poland*). Likewise, Alexander I's policy was motivated not only by his genuine interest in European peace, but also by considerations of "realistic" national policy, aiming at the growth of Russia's power and prestige in Europe. Neither was Nicholas I solely a champion of

lofty principles. There is enough evidence to show his lively interest in Russia's commercial expansion: he was thinking of the mouth of the Danube and of the Straits as much as of the fate of the Greeks. And this applies, of course, to the whole Near-Eastern policy of Russia in modern times. On the other hand, it is difficult to agree with the contention of the authors that "envious" Europe tried to encroach upon Russia throughout the course of her history. Russia had to fight with her immediate neighbors for disputed territories just as the Western nations had been fighting between themselves for similar reasons. In some of these struggles religious conflicts played a certain part, but so they did in the West too—witness the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To present the various invasions of Russia from the West as a perennial European crusade against Russia is hardly correct. After all, like Hitler in our days, Charles XII, Napoleon, and William II were at war not only with Russia but also with a number of European states which were Russia's allies in the struggle.

The title of Mr. Normano's book is somewhat misleading as the reader will not find much economics in it. There is a real need for a history of Russian economic ideas, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Normano has not produced such a history. Here and there he gives some valuable information on such subjects as the influence of Adam Smith in Russia or the penetration of Saint-Simonism (in its Second Empire version) into the Russian bureaucratic circles in the days of Alexander II. Most of the book, however, is given over to the exposition of the author's

own philosophy of Russian history, in some respects not unlike that of the Hydes. Once more the emphasis is on the peculiar character or even uniqueness of the Russian development although the author is fully aware of the foreign inspiration behind the various brands of Russian "nativism." Mr. Normano's main contention is that "all classes, all groups, all nations of the Russian Empire . . . sooner or later arrived at the common faith of the Russian people: their country's destiny to solve mankind's social problems." This messianic attitude, we are told, went hand in hand with the general opposition to the liberalism and capitalism of the Western world. According to the author, the only exception to this rule was the Orthodox Marxists of the Menshevik variety who, it seems, are his pet aversion as he mentions their apostasy not once but repeatedly.

I believe, however, that a close and unprejudiced investigation of Russian intellectual history would not reveal such a complete agreement on the tenets of a messianic and anti-Western faith. The author tries to produce the impression of this supposed unanimity by several devices of doubtful methodological validity. Thus, he disposes of one of the opposite trends, that inspired by the English classical economy, by somewhat arbitrarily calling it an "isolated episode" although his book contains evidence of its fairly widespread and prolonged influence. On the contrary, when it comes to the beliefs and tendencies which he considers to be in harmony with the Russian national spirit, the extent of their influence is greatly exaggerated. For example: "The Russians arrived in the nineteenth century at the conclusion that the

Wes
Eng
cou
peri
conq
cism

At
thor
belo
ers,
spec
then
the
sion
inter
insta
Russ
idea
trio
Spen
Vlad
tain
great
in
writ
of L
prot
ticul
Mr.
that
synt
evol
chor
mus
other
call
one
which
its o
nation
of th
which
my
of P
seve
indi
M
I kn
lish

West is rotten" (p. 5); "Marx and Engels practically conquered the country" (p. 72—speaking of the period after 1848); "Russia was conquered by German romanticism" (p. 87).

Another device used by the author consists in taking some ideas belonging to widely different thinkers, separating them from their respective context, and then lumping them together as having supposedly the same essential meaning. Occasionally, this leads to virtual misinterpretation. Thus we learn, for instance, that "the climax of the Russian reaction against Western ideas was represented by the great trio of predecessors of Oswald Spengler: Danilevsky, Leontyev, Vladimir Solovyev" (p. 108). Certainly, Solovyev would have been greatly surprised to find himself in such company after having written several works in refutation of Danilevsky's theory, and of its proto-Spenglerian features in particular. No more convincing is Mr. Norman's general conclusion that Bolshevism is a harmonious synthesis and consummation of the evolution of ideas in Russia—"a last chord whose harmony crowns the musical fugue." Apart from all other considerations one hardly can call a synthesis, and a "harmonious" one at that, an ideological system which found it necessary to ensure its own triumph by a forcible elimination of all the competing trends of thought. This is not the way in which musical fugues are written: my dictionary tells me that the art of polyphony implies the use of several "melodically independent and individual parts or voices."

Mr. Dorosh's little book, as far as I know, is the first attempt in English to trace the history of Russian

constitutionalism. Its publication is timely. In these days when so many writers try to assure us that "government by coercion" is an old and firmly established Russian tradition, and that the Russian people never have been interested in political liberty, one feels grateful to an author who reminds us of the fact that after all there had been constitutional movements in Russian history. Within the compass of his brief sketch, Mr. Dorosh succeeds in imparting some useful information on the subject, but I regret to say that he has not done it full justice. First of all, it was not necessary to begin with the medieval popular assembly (*the Veche*) which hardly can be brought under the heading of constitutionalism, and it also would have been wiser to omit the recital of some elementary facts of Russian political history. This would have left more space for an ampler treatment of such topics as the political ideas of Radishchev, Speransky's constitutional project, the difference between the constitutional plans of the Northern and the Southern Decembrists, the various brands of *Zemstvo* constitutionalism, and, above all, the actual working of the constitutional régime as established in 1905–06. Some of the author's interpretations are open to question. He refuses, for instance, to compare the *Zemsky Sobor* of Muscovite Russia with the Western Estates on the ground that it was based on group representation. But so were all the Western Estates, including the English Parliament, the only one of these medieval institutions eventually to become a national representative assembly. Unfortunately, the book contains a certain number of factual errors. To cite but a few examples:

at Peter's death the plan was to have his grandson Peter succeed him, not his son Alexis (p. 32) who had died before his father; the "child emperor" Ivan Antonovich did not die at the time of his deposition (p. 41) but many years later, in captivity; Catherine's Legislative Commission did not represent "all classes" (p. 44); the plot to depose Paul was not "foiled by his death" (p. 49)—he was murdered by the conspirators. Finally, it is hardly possible to say that during the reign of Nicholas I "the spiritual life was dead" (p. 82) if one remembers that this was the golden age of Russian literature, the time of the debate between the Slavophils and the Westerners, and of many other cultural and intellectual developments.

MICHAEL KARPOVICH

Harvard University

WHITE, WILLIAM C. *Made in the U.S.S.R.* New York, Knopf, 1944. 159 pp. \$2.00.

STRONG, ANNA LOUISE. *Peoples in the U.S.S.R.* New York, Macmillan Company, 1944. 246 pp. \$2.50.

NAZAROFF, ALEXANDER. *The Land of the Russian People.* Philadelphia and New York, Lippincott, 1944. 160 pp. \$2.00.

Today, more than ever, young Americans need to know and understand Russia. As Mr. William White says, Russian and American youth "will be neighbors in the postwar world. That world will be more neighborly if they are friends." The three books reviewed here seek to interpret Russia to American youth under sixteen. In subject matter,

each serves to reinforce the other from different angles.

Mr. William C. White's *Made in the U.S.S.R.* is one of a series of books on the arts and crafts of different nations. Eminently readable, the book discusses such topics as the Russian ikon, village handicraft, Kazan leather, Caucasian silver, Bokhara rugs, painting, music, the ballet; finally, more specifically products of post-revolutionary Russia—tractors and dynamos.

Each of the arts and crafts is presented in its historical setting, showing the changes in the lives and customs of the Russian people at the various stages of their development. The best chapters are those devoted to the handicraft and the ballet. The story is interestingly and vividly told, and the book is provided with well-chosen illustrations. It is unfortunate that Russian folklore (especially the *bilyny* and folk tales) which has always been a major source of inspiration for Russian men of letters, musicians, and painters received too scant treatment. Incomprehensible is the total omission of Russian architecture, while a whole chapter is devoted to painting—an art in which Russians have never reached the pre-eminence comparable to that achieved in the other arts.

On the whole the book presents a rather one-sided picture of Russia, one that over-emphasises the New at the expense of the Old, somehow failing to establish a continuity between them.

Anna Louise Strong, the author of *Peoples in the U.S.S.R.*, is a veteran interpreter of Soviet Russia. Ever since Lincoln Steffens, in 1921, fired her with enthusiasm for revolutionary Russia, she has made her

home there, taking only occasional trips to her native Seattle. She married a Russian, and since 1930 has been editing the *Moscow News*—an English-language newspaper in the U.S.S.R. To promote an understanding between America and Soviet Russia became, as she said, her life's purpose.

In her latest book, Miss Strong tells the story of the peoples living within the borders of the sixteen Soviet republics. As she says in her introduction, her aim is to convey something of "the vigor, vitality, and importance of those many different Soviet peoples who share with all of us the postwar world." To many readers, it is, indeed, a whole new world. Such peoples, as the Kazakhs, who inhabit a territory a third as large as the United States, the Turkmenians, the Kirghiz, the Tadjiks, until recently, were names totally unknown to the outside world; but more, undoubtedly, will be heard of them in the years to come.

Miss Strong is one of the very few foreigners who has actually visited fifteen of the sixteen Soviet republics. She tells the story of these various peoples deftly in legends of their past and in their many-sided contributions to the present life of the U.S.S.R.

Few will deny today the farsightedness of the Soviet government's policy toward the minorities, and the bankruptcy of the old Tsarist policy of deliberate Russification. Much progress was undoubtedly achieved in the last quarter century in some of the backward, borderland regions due to Stalin's policy of cultural autonomy. It is unfortunate that Miss Strong in her zeal to make these achievements more striking, defeats her end by over-

emphasis. Thus, she distorts historical perspective by grotesquely exaggerating the backwardness of some of the border states before the Revolution. To give one out of many examples, she makes the following statement regarding Minsk, the capital of the White Russian Republic: "Under the tsars Minsk became a ghetto town in which two-fifths of the people were Jews. There was no water or sewer system; there were no street cars or electric lights—for a city of nearly a hundred thousand people. There were public wells in some streets and stinking outhouses in the back yards." The reviewer happens to have lived in Minsk before 1917. While he agrees that Minsk was not a very attractive city, still, long before 1917, it had a water and sewer system, street cars, electricity; what is more—public libraries and excellent schools.

Miss Strong is right in saying that the national minorities do many things today which they couldn't before—they can educate their children in their native languages, they can maintain armies, and even send ambassadors (since 1944), but—and this is the point—on all vital issues the sixteen constituent republics take orders from the Kremlin. Miss Strong knows this, of course, but nowhere does she give the slightest indication that this may be the case.

Once Miss Strong's bias is known and discounted, however, her present book, excellently illustrated by the way, becomes a useful addition to popular books on Russia. Much of what she says about the life of the various Asiatic peoples of the U.S.S.R. is new and makes fascinating reading. The strongest impression one gains from this book

is the striking parallel between the U.S.S.R. and the United States as two great pioneering nations, two vital melting pots of many races and nationalities.

Of the three books reviewed here, Mr. Nazaroff's *The Land of the Russian People* is the ablest and most informative presentation of Russia to young Americans. Only a skilled writer with a native's understanding of Russia could have performed this task so successfully. Almost a third of Mr. Nazaroff's book (the first three chapters) consists of a fascinating description of a trip from Vladivostok across Siberia to Moscow and Leningrad, then to the Ukraine, Crimea, the Caucasus and Central Asia; thence, back to Vladivostok. In a clear and straight-forward style, these chapters convey much pertinent information on Russia's topography, climate, history, and ethnology. The last four chapters consist of an accurate and lucid outline of Russia's historical development: "How Russia Came to Be," "The Tsars," "The Emperors," "The Soviets."

It is, indeed, an unusual experience to read a contemporary book on Russia which is as free of major historical errors as Mr. Nazaroff's. A few inaccuracies, however, may be noted. The total eschewing of Trotsky as one of the principal organizers of the Red Army, as well as of the coup d'état of November 7th, historically, is scarcely justifiable. Not all Russian socialists were the followers of Karl Marx (p. 142)—the agrarian socialists (the Social Revolutionaries) were rather the followers of Bukunin. Finally, it may be doubted that the Bolsheviks formed the majority in the Russian Democratic Party in the years preceding the Revolution

(p. 142); they held the majority only at the London Congress of the Party in 1903, when the party split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. But these things are minor. What matters is that Mr. Nazaroff succeeds in giving a vivid and on the whole accurate picture of the forces which have shaped modern Russia. Exceptionally fine photographs greatly enhance the value of this little book which forcefully demonstrates, as Mr. Nazaroff says, "that there are no more Old and New Russia . . . there is but one Russia that continues."

Mr. Nazaroff's book, and with some reservations, those of Mr. William White and Miss Strong, could be recommended not only to young Americans of high school age but to adults as well.

D. S. von Mohrenschmidt
Dartmouth College

CARDWELL, ANN SU. *Poland and Russia: The Last Quarter Century*. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1944. 251 pp. \$2.75.

Mrs. Cardwell's volume falls roughly into two parts: a diplomatic history of Russo-Polish relations before the outbreak of World War II and the treatment accorded to Poland and the Poles by the Soviets after September 1939. The second part of the book, in the reviewer's opinion, will be read with particular interest. Mrs. Cardwell and her husband are Americans who had resided in Poland from 1922 to the autumn of 1939; neither of them has any Slavic blood or is a Roman Catholic. Mrs. Cardwell writes with obvious sincerity and earnestness and her study, although unmistakably a plea for Poland, cannot

be dismissed as mere anti-Soviet propaganda. It is clear, on the other hand, that the author has little liking for Russia or the Soviet system, an attitude which is likely to prejudice some of her readers and to impair the usefulness of the book. Mrs. Cardwell's information on diplomatic history is drawn almost exclusively from official Polish sources, but this perhaps should not count against her since wartime restrictions and censorship offer little opportunity for unbiased factual investigations.

Mrs. Cardwell left Poland in the middle of September 1939. Her account of subsequent events is based not on personal observations but on interviews with persons who had escaped from the parts of Poland held by the Soviets; on "letters got out secretly," and reports of the underground; on "letters from Polish citizens deported to the U.S.S.R., and, after the signing of the Polish-Soviet pact of June 30, 1941, upon depositions made by certain of those who were released" from Russian internment. Dependence on these sources, legitimate as they undoubtedly are, may tend to give a picture which is, perhaps, even gloomier than would have been the case if the situation was viewed as a whole and was examined from every angle. Yet it seems certain that many of the sinister events and devious political moves chronicled by Mrs. Cardwell are part of the record, and that the treatment of Poland by Moscow presents one of the darkest pages in the relations between the United Nations.

It is regrettable that in discussing the ethnographic and religious complexion of the population in the disputed territories of Eastern Poland, Mrs. Cardwell relies entirely on

Polish data and does not mention that these statistics, like their Russian counterpart, inspire but slight confidence. The case for Poland would have been strengthened by a brief review of the Russo-Polish relations in the nineteenth century, especially of the part played by the Polish demands for the Lithuanian and Ukrainian provinces in the insurrections of 1830 and of 1863. The author, however, makes few references to Poland's past history some knowledge of which, in the reviewer's opinion, is essential to an understanding of the current issues. These references are not always fortunate. One cannot read without uneasiness and bewilderment the following statement which, unhappily, occurs on the first page of Mrs. Cardwell's book: ". . . In 1772, Frederick the Great of Prussia and Maria Theresa of Austria found excuse to take the first slices of Poland. In 1793, each took another portion, and in 1795 they completed their reprehensible undertaking, thus causing Poland as a state to disappear from the map." It would be difficult to pack more errors in two brief sentences. No one could possibly gather from them that the chief architect of the three partitions of Poland was Catherine II of Russia who on each occasion obtained the lion's share of the spoil. Austria, moreover, was not a party to the partition of 1793, and both Maria Theresa and Frederick the Great must be absolved from all responsibility for the second and the third partition for the good reason that the former died in 1780 and the latter in 1786, that is, years before the events Mrs. Cardwell rightly deplores. These regrettable slips should not prejudice the readers against Mrs. Cardwell's book. She

does not claim to be a historian, and her study offers much valuable information bearing not only on the future of Poland but, perhaps, on that of Eastern and Central Europe.

MICHAEL T. FLORINSKY

Columbia University

LIBERMAN, S. I. *Diel i Liudi (Na Sovetskoi Stroike)*. [Events and Men: Organization of Soviet Industry]. New York, New Democracy Books, 1944. 306 pp. \$3.00.

This unpretentious volume is well worth reading. Its author has belonged to the group of specialists who had played a very considerable rôle in implementing Lenin's change of course, the New Economic Policy, the famous N.E.P.

Grown up in a Hassidic religious Jewish family in the Ukraine, Mr. Liberman was attracted by the powerful magnet of Russian culture, as well as the revolutionary movement. Leaving his parents' home, he went to live in Zhitomir. Falling under the influence of Plekhanov's writings and Berdyaev's personality, he became a Marxist. After passing examinations for the secondary school's course, Mr. Liberman set out for Vienna, where he studied philosophy, economics, and history. He also followed closely the intra-party discussions of the Austro-Hungarian Social-Democrats.

The events of the 1905 revolution had decided the author to return to Russia. He joined the illegal organization of the Social-Democratic Party in Odessa and was active in the trade union work, as well as on the local party committee.

The suppression of the revolutionary movement by Stolypin, led Mr. Liberman (in common with

many other young revolutionaries) to abandon active political work. He found then an outlet for his energy and talents in the field of lumber industry and trade.

One cannot escape the impression that business organization, the pathos of economically creative life, was nearer to Mr. Liberman's inclinations and temperament than the narrow trammels of underground (as well as above-ground) revolutionary party activity.

Within a few years, the young Marxist had made his mark. By 1914, he controlled three large companies.

When the March tocsin sounded, the author immediately resigned from active participation in his companies and offered his services to the economic section of the Petrograd Soviet. Later on he became a vice-president of the organization responsible for the wood-fuel supply of the railroads. November did not interrupt his work, as he belonged to that fraction of the Mensheviks who believed in abstaining from boycott of the Soviet power. In 1918, Mr. Liberman was invited by the Soviet government to help to organize the lumber industry and began to play a guiding rôle in it.

In the course of his work, the author came to know the principal leaders of the Bolsheviks. His plan of establishing the so-called "trust" form of organization in lumber industry led to the adoption of it in other fields of economic activity.

During the N.E.P., Mr. Liberman had enjoyed the confidence and support of Krasin and had conducted long and complicated negotiations with western capitalists while on his numerous trips abroad.

With the change in the attitude of

the Communist Party towards the N.E.P., the author's influence and standing with the Soviet government became undermined. The Soviet political police were closely scrutinizing his activities and making it difficult for him to preserve his peace of mind. The author came to the conclusion that his period of usefulness to Soviet Russia had drawn to a close. Taking advantage of a mission abroad, he sent in his resignation and did not return.

The author's description of the growth of the Soviet lumber industry offers an excellent illustration of the trends of thought of Lenin, and some other party leaders during the N.E.P.

The thumb-nail sketches of Lenin, Trotsky, Rykov, Larin, Krasin, Dzerzhinsky *et al.* are well drawn. They are both objective and true to life. The descriptions of meetings of the highest Soviet administrative officials are vivid and revealing.

Mr. Liberman had lived and acted in an important economic post during the N.E.P. This personal experience is invaluable in making his pages so fascinating to the student of that period. There is little bitterness in this volume. The author also possesses the faculty of differentiating the core from the surface of events. It is therefore interesting to note that he does not believe in the "treason" of the important Communists, purged in the late thirties.

Mr. Liberman defines Bolshevism as a dictatorship which does not fall within the framework of the usual concept of democracy. He believes, however, that it is a very special kind of dictatorship, which seeks the support of the masses and finds that support in wide circles of the population. He says that in Russia

we see a social democracy in the framework of a political dictatorship. The author is looking hopefully forward to the continuation of the process of democratization of Russia.

This book deserves prompt translation into English. It is a real find for the student of Russian history.

D. FEDOTOFF WHITE
Indian Rocks, Fla.

MANNING, CLARENCE A. *Ukrainian Literature: Studies of the Leading Authors.* Jersey City, N. J., Ukrainian National Association, 1944. 126 pp.

CHAMBERLIN, WILLIAM H. *The Ukraine: A Submerged Nation.* New York, Macmillan, 1944. 91 pp. \$1.75.

These two small books are good companion volumes for a hurried survey of the Ukraine from the overlapping cultural and political points of view.

Professor Manning's history of Ukrainian literature should prove useful not only to students of Eastern Europe but to all interested in literary trends in general, for he has gone to considerable pains to point out the impact of world literary movements upon the development of Ukrainian literature. He tells how modern Ukrainian writing was born as a part of the enlightened scepticism of the late eighteenth century when Ivan Kotlyarivsky published his *Eneida*. It developed rapidly under the impact of the Romantic movement begun by Rousseau and Herder, swung with Taras Shevchenko into the "great flowering of poetry in Russia and in Western Europe," and with

Pantaleimon Kulish followed the parallel interest in the historical novel awakened by Scott. With Marko Vovchok it cast off the over-idealization of the Romantics in favor of a presentation of the hardships and difficulties of daily life, and under Ivan Franko took up the cause of national unification at the close of the century.

A period of neo-romanticism followed the age of realism in Ukrainian literature as elsewhere, with Lesya Ukrainka as its representative. Vasil Stefanyk presented the new realism of the misery and despair of the underprivileged factory worker. With O. Oles, Ukrainian literature became further adapted to world models as it left the narrow and provincial field of topics treated by earlier writers and swung into the current symbolism. Under the Soviets, the Ukrainian writers, though now free to use their language, have, Professor Manning concludes, become "thoroughly standardized in the pattern set by the modern ideological state."

Ukrainian literature, however, as Professor Manning shows, is much more than a reflection of world literature. It has its own unique qualities arising from the distinctive character and the distinctive experience of a nation of forty million people, as well as from the individual contributions made by individual writers. It can not merely borrow from world literature but has much to contribute to it. Its chief characteristic is "its confidence and belief in democracy in every form."

Professor Manning has done well to avoid the temptation to produce an undigested encyclopedia of Ukrainian authors. The even dozen whom he has selected for treatment are thus presented in sufficient ful-

ness to leave sharp impressions of their personalities and their work. Each stands out in bold profile—Kotlyarevsky, "the talented founder of modern Ukrainian literature;" Shevchenko, "the bard of Ukraine . . . a poet by the grace of God and genius who set the path for the Ukrainian people;" Kulish, "great in his positive activity but equally great in his defects and errors." Marko Vovchok's "understanding of the emotions and feelings of the peasant women struck a new note in Ukrainian and Russian literature;" Franko's career was "a prosaic record of duty recognized and executed, of articles written, of difficulties surmounted." Oles is "the poet's poet, a man whose art requires sympathy and understanding," and so on for the others.

If there is in Professor Manning's treatment anything to question it is an implied assumption that greatness in literature is identical with service to nationalism.

Chamberlin's *The Ukraine: A Submerged People* contains little that is new either in material or in point of view. It does however furnish in condensed form for the general reader a convenient and able description of "the chain of historical vicissitudes that prevented the Ukrainians, the most numerous racial group in Eastern Europe after the Great Russians, from achieving the status of an independent nation." There are deft portrayals of the land and the people, of the "heroic age" of the Cossacks, of "the Ukraine under the shadows" of Russian and Polish rule, and of the nationalist rebirth culminating in brief independence at the close of the First World War. Then come two chapters on the Ukraine between the wars, one on the Ukraine

under the Soviets, the other on the Western Ukraine, under Poland.

In his final chapter on "The Ukraine and the Future," Chamberlin draws on the past to speculate about the future of national minorities in general, and of those of the Soviet Union in particular. He concludes that the chief problem facing the future of "the great Eurasian federation of peoples in the Soviet Union" is that of "supplementing its publicly owned and operating economic system with adequate guarantees for the individual against arbitrary acts of the state."

Several pages are devoted to a survey of the position of the federative republics under the Soviet constitution, with a flat assertion that "the whole question of the validity or irrelevance of the Soviet constitution change revolves around the maintenance or the abandonment of this one-party dictatorship."

The author's final word is that "A free Ukraine, no longer subject to political dictation from Moscow, united with other peoples of the Soviet Union only by voluntary bonds of mutual economic interest, is an indispensable element in a free Europe and in a free world." Regarding the likelihood of this happy outcome he does not commit himself.

OLIVER J. FREDERIKSEN

Miami University

NABOKOV, VLADIMIR. *Nikolai Gogol.* Norfolk, Conn., New Directions, 1944. 172 pp. \$1.50.

Translators seem to have conspired to mistreat and mutilate Gogol. True, he is the least translatable of the Russian great, for, as Nabokov says, "his work, as all

great literary achievements, is a phenomenon of language and not one of ideas." The result is that outside of Russia, and particularly in English speaking countries, almost nothing is known about Gogol. Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, perhaps Pushkin with the more enlightened ones—yes, but Gogol remains a question mark. Nabokov's *Gogol* is a revelation even to those who grew up with Gogol. This little book of some 150 pages, which the author calls "notes," is in itself a "phenomenon of language and not one of ideas," thus becoming a bridge to the queerest spirit that Russia produced. I cannot imagine that anybody who read Nabokov's "notes" could resist looking for himself into Gogol, even though translations to be found may be miserable. Stimulated by Nabokov, a person sensitive to art will not let himself be discouraged by the author's own austere attitude that to understand Gogol one must learn Russian first.

Nabokov's book is anything but a biography with a neat sequence of born (-where, -when), mother's-father's-teachers' influences, early readings, travels, and so on. It is altogether not a book about "influences," either on Gogol or of Gogol on anyone else. The author even resists elaborating on the point that if Dostoevsky had any predecessor at all, it was Gogol. Nabokov attempts an analysis from within, concentrating on what to him are the three most important works: *The Government Inspector*, *Dead Souls*, and *The Overcoat*, discarding, incidentally, Gogol's folkloristic, "romantic" early short stories. Nabokov's analysis is one of a creative interpreter whose sole concern is the intrinsic structure of

autonomous art. He shies away from the Freudian method, thus manifesting a great deal of restraint, for nothing could be more tempting than to "psychoanalyze" Gogol, a genius of confusion, repression, distortion, and transmutation. That Gogol was a weakling, a coward, a liar (to himself more than to anyone else), a man whose self-destructive drives forced him to burn some of his manuscripts and to become at the end of his unhappy life a religious maniac—all this, fortunately, is of little concern to Nabokov. He senses the integrity of Gogol's art *in spite* of Gogol. Instead of running after Gogol the man, he reconstructs intuitively the subterranean essence of Gogol the artist, the artist of an "upside-down world." And as long as man anywhere will be sensitive to the fact that the world which matters may be upside-down, may be irrational—Gogol will remain not a curiosity but a magician. In this presentation of Gogol lies Nabokov's achievement.

Opposing tradition, Nabokov shows the fallacy of considering Gogol a "humorist," a "forerunner of the naturalistic school, and a realistic painter of life in Russia." He identifies himself so deeply with Gogol that he is able to retrace the creative process. He shows *how* Gogol wrote. The cerebral *what* becomes less important, for the *what* comes out of the *how*. Nabokov discloses the "superlogical moves" of Gogol's style; how Gogol "swerves into the irrational;" his twists and jumps and swift transformations; his creation of an absurd transcendental world—which is art. Nabokov is at his best where he demonstrates Gogol's symbolical use of objects and his "peculiar manner of letting 'secondary' dream characters

pop up at every turn of the play (or novel, or story) to flaunt for a second their life-like existence."

Gogol was a magician. So is Nabokov. There is uncanny magic in the way he arrives at the intimate depths of Gogol's queer spirit, depths that Gogol would rather have not known himself and which he tried to escape, condemning and destroying and utterly misunderstanding his own work.

Gogol's world was an invented world and had nothing to do with "reality." His facts were imagined facts.

If there is any leitmotif at all in Nabokov's intuitive book, it is Gogol's twofold misfortune to have been misunderstood by others and never to have understood himself.

It is bad enough to be misunderstood by others, but this is the doom of all great. With Gogol the tragedy lies deeper, namely in his own misconception of his artistic self. At the close of the first part of *Dead Souls*, Gogol's imaginative power was at its end. The end came with the futile question that he proposed to himself: what is art and what should it be? Gogol's answer lay in the general direction of moral purification.

What Nabokov discloses is the tragic dichotomy between the self-conception of the artist, his impotent surface verbalizations and aspirations—and the sovereignty of his creation. As in the case of Gogol, it happens that the artist is the last to understand the self-sufficient and independent life of his art.

"Great literature skirts the irrational. *Hamlet* is the wild dream of a neurotic scholar. Gogol's *The Overcoat* is a grotesque and grim nightmare making black holes in the dim pattern of life. . . . Steady

Pushkin, matter-of-fact Tolstoy, restrained Chekhov have all had their moments of irrational insight which simultaneously blurred the sentence and disclosed a secret meaning worth the sudden focal shift. But with Gogol this shifting is the very basis of his art, so that whenever he tried to write in the round hand of literary tradition and to treat rational ideas in a logical way, he lost all trace of talent. When, as in his immortal *The Overcoat*, he really let himself go and pottered happily on the brink of his private abyss, he became the greatest artist that Russia has yet produced."

The greatness of Gogol's poetic prose consists in its extra-national truth—the truth of perception of the superlogical, of magic in an imagined world. "It is Gogol's world and as such wholly different from Tolstoy's world, or Pushkin's, or Chekhov's, or my own." What is the real message of *The Overcoat*, the message that survives? "Something is very wrong and men are mild lunatics engaged in pursuits that seem to them very important while an absurdly logical force keeps them at their futile jobs—this is the real message of the story." Nabokov achieved depth-reading and illumination of Gogol from within.

The reviewer is conscious of the danger of too much enthusiasm. She may not be taken seriously. In spite of Nabokov's creative and inventive command of English (he happens to be one of these rare bi-lingual human beings)—there is a certain clumsiness in his style (which, incidentally, suits Gogol well). But Nabokov's interpretative brackets frequently inserted into quotations from Gogol make reading difficult in spots. One may also

object to an obsessive play with assonances and alliterations, such as "perverse perseverance," "chubby cheeks . . . cherub," "sickening silliness," "subtle subtitle," "celestial cereals," "demurely murmurs," "capricious ship Capri" etc.

In order not to end on this picayunish note, one more quotation for those who would like to know whether Gogol is a prose-writer, a playwright, or a poet: "Gogol's play (and for that matter *Dead Souls* and his later short stories) is poetry in action, and by poetry I mean mysteries of the irrational as perceived through rational words. True poetry of that kind provokes—not laughter and not tears—but a radiant smile of perfect satisfaction, a purr of beatitude—and a writer may well be proud of himself if he can make his reader, or more exactly some of his readers, smile and purr that way."

While Nabokov smiles and purrs at Gogol, I confess having done likewise reading his book.

VERA SANDOMIRSKY

Washington, D. C.

ZOUBOFF, PETER P. *Vladimir Solov'yev on Godmanhood* (with a translation of Solovyev's *Lectures on Godmanhood*). New York, International University Press, 1944. 233 pp. \$3.75.

Vladimir Solovyev (1853-1900) has long been widely recognized as the preeminent Christian philosopher of modern Russia—one whose influence is strongly marked on Berdyaev, Lossky, Bulgakov, Florensky, and other thinkers of our own or recent times. Unfortunately, few of his writings are available in English. The translation of his *Lec-*

tures on Godmanhood—one of his earliest, yet most profound works—was greatly to be desired. This work Peter Zouboff has undertaken.

The translation on the whole is very good—and the task can have been no easy one. At times we could wish for a little less literal translation, a little more paraphrasing for the sake of clearness of thought and fluency of expression. Page 226 is a good example of this. Some additional footnotes might have helped. *Nachalo*, which means sometimes "beginning," sometimes "principle," ought generally to be translated by the second of these words when preceded by "divine" or "human"—otherwise confusion results (e.g. p. 226). Solovyev's work, "*The Religious Foundations of Life*" (p. 17) ought rather to be translated "*The Spiritual Foundations of Life*" (*Dukhovnyya*).

There is a valuable introduction sketching the life of Solovyev, with a brief discussion of his alleged "conversion" to Roman Catholicism, also the background of Solovyev's ideas, and an excellent exposition of the place of "Godmanhood" in his philosophy. The discussion of the background is good and does justice to the influence of the mystical thought of St. Gregory Palama and other great Christian thinkers upon Solovyev. One would welcome, however, at least a brief treatment of the influence of Spinoza (so powerful in Solovyev's writings until nearly the end), of Leibnitz, of Yurkevich, and perhaps of Ivantssov-Platonov.

Dr. Zouboff's discussion of "Solovyev, Philosopher, Mystic, Poet," is informative. One might desire a further critique of Solovyev's thought, especially during the earlier

period; for example, the incompatibility between his mystical intuitions and his metaphysics. The question of Solovyev's "conversion" to Roman Catholicism is treated as well as could be expected in the compass of half a dozen pages. One might wish that some of the theological views of the philosopher during his pro-Roman period, especially those relating to Church authority, had been examined. These are, to the mind of this reviewer, quite incompatible with the official position of Roman Catholicism, as defined by Pius IX and the Vatican Council, and Solovyev could not have failed to be aware of this incompatibility. The omission of such an analysis, however, is shared by most of Solovyev's biographers and critics.

For Solovyev, religion is the connection of man and the world with an unconditional Principle, the source and focus of all that exists. In practice, contemporary religion often falls short of what is implied in this definition, and by neglecting the rights of matter and the social question, supplies a limited, conditional justification to positivism and socialism. "The old traditional form of religion has issued forth from the faith in God, but it has failed to carry out this faith to the end. The modern extra-religious civilization proceeds from the faith in man, but it, too, remains inconsistent—does not carry its faith to its (logical) end. But when both these faiths, the faith in God and the faith in man, are carried out consistently and realized in full, they meet in the unique, complete, and integral truth of Godmanhood." (p. 99.)

This is the central thesis of Solovyev in these *Lectures*, and it is led up to and sustained by practical, meta-

physical, and epistemological considerations, as well as by the data supplied by religious intuitions and experience, and by the Christological dogmas of the Church. There will, of course, be objections raised from various camps. The reconciliation and synthesis of the tenets of various philosophical schools, brilliant as it is, will seem to some too "simpliste," verbal, rather than real. The idea of an eternal Humanity, of a "Sophia" which is at once within the divine being and the soul of the world that exists—is not free from tendencies toward Pantheism and Monism, which are elsewhere repudiated by Solovyev, and which are certainly as alien to his main thought and to his religious intuitions, as they are to Orthodox Christianity itself. Yet the work is a profound one, and it is difficult to believe that its author was still in his early twenties when he delivered these *Lectures*. His metaphysical system seems to have sprung into

existence all at once, Minerva-like, from the philosopher's head and to have been little modified during the rest of his life—though his thought was changing very radically when his premature death cut it short.

It is to be regretted that the titles of the books listed in the bibliography have not, for the most part, been translated into English. And there is surely little point in listing the place of publication as *Parizh* (elsewhere Paris), though perhaps there is more excuse for *Moskva*. It is confusing to find now St. Petersburg, now Leningrad. It is not helpful to find a date given as "*Janvaria 1-go*," or to find reference to *Otets* (Father) Bulgakov. There are also too many misprints and the book needs an index.

In spite of minor blemishes, however, the work is a valuable one and will fill a real need.

WILLIAM H. DUNPHY
Philadelphia, Pa.

Bibliography

Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1944

BY NIKANDER AND KATHERINE STRELSKY

I BOOKS

- Abraham, Gerald. *Tchaikovsky: A Short Biography*. London, Duckworth. 144 pp. 5s.
- Acker, Helen. *Three Boys of Old Russia*. New York, Thomas Nelson. 258 pp. \$2.50. (Biographical sketches of Tolstoy, Gorky, Shalyapin).
- Afinogenov, Alexander N. *Listen, Professor!* (Play in 3 acts). New York, French. 78 pp. \$0.75.
- Allen, W. E. D. and Muratoff, P. *The Russian Campaigns of 1941-1943*. London, Penguin Books. 192 pp. 9d.
- Almedingen, E. M. *Frossia*. New York, Harcourt, Brace. 358 pp. \$2.50. (Novel of Russian Civil War by an émigrée).
- Anderson, Paul B. *People, Church and State in Modern Russia*. New York, Macmillan. 240 pp. \$2.50.
- Asquith, Michael. *Famine: Quaker Work in Russia*. Foreword by Melville MacKenzie. Oxford, Eng., University Press. 70 pp. 2s.
- Baikov, A. A. *Twenty-five Years of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.* Transl. M. Zaret. New York, American Russian Institute. 40 pp. \$0.25.
- Barnes, Leonard. *Soviet Light on the Colonies*. Maps and diagrams by J. F. Horrabin. London, Penguin Books. 288 pp. 9d.
- Berdyaev, Nicholas. *Slavery and Freedom*. Transl. R. M. French. New York, Scribner's. 271 pp. \$2.75.
- Bergson, Abram. *The Structure of Soviet Wages: A Study in Socialist Economics*. (Harvard Economic Studies, Vol. LXXVI), Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press. 255 pp. \$3.50.
- Bienstock, Gregory, Schwarz, Solomon M., and Yugow, Aaron. *Management in Russian Industry and Agriculture* (Institute of World Affairs, Vol. I) New York, Oxford. 198 pp. \$3.00.
- Bilainkin, George. *Maisky: Ten Years Ambassador*. London, Allen and Unwin. 400 pp. 15s.
- Bilmanis, Alfred (comp.) *Latvian-Russian Relations: Documents*. Washington, D. C., Latvian Legation. 255 pp. Distribution limited.
- Boelza, Igor. *Handbook of Soviet Musicians*. Edited by Alan Bush. Sec. ed. London, The Pilot Press. 101 pp. 4s.

- Borodin, George. *Red Surgeon.* London, Museum Press. 224 pp. 15s.
- Bulatov, M. and Pinto, V. de S. (eds). *Wild Geese and Other Russian Fables.* New York—London, Transatlantic. 72 pp. 9s. 6d.
- Cardwell, Ann Su. *Poland and Russia: The Last Quarter Century.* New York, Sheed and Ward. 251 pp. \$2.75.
- Carr, Robert Spencer. *The Bells of St. Ivan's.* New York, Appleton-Century. 186 pp. \$2.00.
- Carter, Herbert Dyson. *Russia's Secret Weapon.* London, Muller. 104 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Chamberlin, William Henry. *Ukraine, a Submerged Nation.* New York, Macmillan. 91 pp. \$1.75.
- Charushin, E. I. *Baby Bears.* Transl. Margaret Rudolph. Ill. George Korff. New York, Macmillan. 40 pp. \$1.00. (True tale for children told by a Russian naturalist).
- Coates, W. P. and Coates, Zelda K. *A History of Anglo-Soviet Relations.* Foreword by David Lloyd-George. London, Martin Lawrence: Pilot. 816 pp. 18s.
- Cornford, F. D. and Salaman, E. P. (trs.) *Poems from the Russian.* New York, Transatlantic. 74 pp. \$1.25. London, Faber. 3s. 6d.
- Crankshaw, Edward. *Russia and Britain.* New York, Hastings. 127 pp. \$2.00.
- Cressey, George B. *Asia's Lands and Peoples.* New York, McGraw-Hill. 608 pp. \$6.00. (Includes a section on Soviet Asia).
- Dallin, David J. *The Real Soviet Russia.* Transl. Joseph Shaplen. New Haven, Yale University Press. 260 pp. \$2.75.
- Davies, R. A. *Canada and Russia—Friends and Neighbors.* Toronto, Progress Pub. Co. 128 pp. \$1.50.
- Dobb, Maurice. *Soviet Economy and the War.* New York, International Publishers. 95 pp. \$1.00.
- *Soviet Planning and Labor in Peace and War.* New York, International Publishers. 124 pp. \$1.00.
- Dorosh, Harry. *Russian Constitutionalism.* New York, Exposition Press. 127 pp. \$2.50.
- Dulles, Foster Rhea. *The Road to Teheran: The History of Russia and America, 1781-1943.* Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press. 279 pp. \$2.50.
- Duranty, Walter. *The U.S.S.R.: The Story of Soviet Russia.* Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott. 293 pp. \$3.00.
- Edelstadt, Vera. *Young Fighters of the Soviet.* New York, Knopf. 104 pp. \$2.00.
- Ehrenburg, Ilya. *The Tempering of Russia.* Transl. Alexander Kaun. New York, Knopf. 356 pp. \$3.00.
- Evans, Stanley. *Churches in the U.S.S.R.* London, Pilot. 160 pp. 5s.
- Fedorov, Eugene K. *The Red Army.* London, Pilot. 48 pp. 5s.
- Fischer, Markoosha. *My Lives in Russia.* New York, Harper. 269 pp. \$2.75.

- Footman, David. *Red Prelude: A Life of A. I. Zhelyabov*. London, The Cresset Press. 250 pp. 2s. 6d.
- Four Soviet War Plays*, by A. Korneichuk, L. Leonov, K. Simonov. Transl. Gerard Shelley. Adapted by Tyrone Guthrie. London, Hutchinson. 208 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Goodhue, Cornelia. *Journey into the Fog: The Story of Vitus Bering and the Bering Sea*. New York, Doubleday-Doran. 179 pp. \$2.50.
- Gordon, Manya. *How to Tell Progress from Reaction: Roads to Industrial Democracy*. New York, Dutton. 320 pp. \$3.00. (Chapters 37-48 deal with Russia).
- Greenberg, Louis. *The Jews in Russia*. Vol. I. *The Struggle for Emancipation*. New Haven, Yale University Press. 210 pp. \$3.00.
- Griffith, Hubert F. *This is Russia*. New York, Transatlantic. 97 pp. \$2.00.
- Grossman, Vasili. *No Beautiful Nights*. Transl. Elizabeth Donnelly. Adapted by Leo Lerman. New York, Messner. 223 pp. \$2.50. (Novel of Russian resistance to German invaders).
- Gruber, Ruth. *I Went to the Soviet Arctic*. Preface by Vilhjalmur Stefansson. Rev. ed. New York, Viking. 320 pp. \$3.50.
- Henderson, Daniel M. *From the Volga to the Yukon*. New York, Hastings House. 256 pp. \$3.00. (The Russian march to Alaska and California).
- Hyde, Fillmore. See Hyde, Nina Verhovsky.
- Hyde, Nina Verhovsky and Hyde, Fillmore. *Russia Then and Always*. New York, Coward-McCann. 331 pp. \$3.00.
- Ignatyev, A. A. *A Subaltern in Old Russia*. London, Hutchinson. 288 pp. 18s.
- Ilin, M. and Segal, E. *A Ring and a Riddle*. Transl. Beatrice Kinhead. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott. 76 pp. \$2.00. (A book for children).
- Joesten, Joachim. *What Russia Wants*. New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 214 pp. \$2.50.
- Kalashnikoff, Nicholas. *Jumper: The Life of a Siberian Horse*. New York, Scribner's. 224 pp. \$2.50.
- Kerr, Walter. *The Russian Army: Its Men, Its Leaders, and Its Battles*. New York, Knopf. 250 pp. \$2.75.
- Kirkien, L. *Russia, Poland, and the Curzon Line*. Duns, Berwickshire, Eng., Caldera House. 62 pp. 3s.
- Kolarz, Walter. *Stalin and Eternal Russia*. London, Lindsay Drummond. 144 pp. 6s.
- Krupskaya, Nadezhda. *Memories of Lenin*. Rev. ed. London, Central Books. 304 pp. 5s.
- Lavrin, Janko. *Tolstoy: An Approach*. London, Methuen. 167 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Leon, Derrick. *Tolstoy: His Life and Work*. London, Routledge. 372 pp. 25s.
- Leonov, Leonid M. *Road to the Ocean*. Transl. Norbert Guterman. New York, L. B. Fischer. 510 pp. \$3.00. (Novel of a Soviet engineer and the Trans-Siberian Railroad).
- Lermontov, Mikhail. *The Prophet and Other Poems*. Transl. Eugene Mark Kayden. Sewanee, Tenn., University of the South. 24 pp. \$1.00.

- Loukomski, George. *Charles Cameron (1740-1812)*. An illustrated monograph on his life and work in Russia. . . . Ed. by Nicholas de Gren, with foreword by Princess Romanovsky-Pavlovsky. . . . New York, Transatlantic. 102 pp. \$6.30. London, Transatlantic, 21s.
- The Face of Russia*. London, Hutchinson. il. 108 pp. 12s. 6d.
- Modern Russian Painting*. London, Hutchinson. 15s.
- Maisky, Ivan M. *Before the Storm: Recollections*. Transl. Gerard Shelley. London, Hutchinson. 176 pp. 15s.
- Mandel, William. *The Soviet Far East and Central Asia*. (Institute of Pacific Relations. Inquiry Series.) New York, Dial Press. 158 pp. \$2.50.
- Manning, Clarence. *Ukrainian Literature: Studies of the Leading Authors*. Foreword by Watson Kirkconnell. Jersey City, Ukrainian National Association. 126 pp. \$1.50.
- Marriott, John A. R. *Anglo-Russian Relations, 1689-1943*. London, Methuen. 227 pp. 8s. 6d.
- Marshall, Herbert and Montague, I. V. S. *Soviet One-Act Plays*. London, Pilot. 106 pp. 4s.
- Martin, John S. (ed.) *The Picture History of Russia*. New York, Crown. \$2.75. (A concise historical survey with 500 pictures).
- Minz, I. *The Red Army*. New York, International Publishers. 160 pp. \$2.00.
- Moisewitsch, M. *Heroes of the Soviet Union*. London, Skinner. 72 pp. 1s. 6d.
- Montague, I. V. S. See Marshall, Herbert.
- Moore, Harriet L. (ed.) *The U.S.S.R. in Reconstruction*. New York, American Russian Institute. 160 pp. \$1.00.
- Moore-Pataleewa, Barbara. *I Am a Woman from Soviet Russia*. London, Gollancz. 304 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Morris, E. G. See Skomorovsky, Boris.
- Muratoff, P. See Allen, W. E. D.
- Myles, Nora Ware. *Behold Russia: A Vivid Description of Modern European Russia*. Dallas, Texas, Mathis-Van-Hort. 258 pp. \$3.00.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Nikolai Gogol*. Norfolk, Conn., New Directions. 172 pp. \$1.50.
- Nazaroff, Alexander I. *The Land of the Russian People*. (Portraits of the Nations Series). Philadelphia, Lippincott. 160 pp. \$2.00.
- Notestein, Frank W. (and others). *The Future Population of Europe and the Soviet Union: Population Projections, 1940-1970*. (League of Nations Publications. New York, Columbia University Press. 315 pp. \$3.50.
- Osipov, K. *Alexander Suvorov: A Biography*. Transl. Edith Bone. London, Hutchinson. 228 pp. 15s.
- Ostrovsky, A. N. *Easy Money and Two Other Plays*. Transl. David Magarshack. London, Allen and Unwin. 296 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Paneth, P. *The Epic of the Soviet Cities*. London, Alliance Press. 128 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Pares, Bernard. *A History of Russia*. 4 rev. ed. New York, Knopf. 575 pp. \$4.75.

- Russia and the Peace*. New York, Macmillan. 203 pp. \$2.50.
- Parry, Albert. *Russian Cavalcade: A Military Record*. New York, Ives Washburn. 334 pp. \$3.50.
- Perventsev, Arkady. *The Ordeal*. Transl. John Cournos. New York, Harper. 262 pp. \$2.50. (The story of a Soviet aircraft factory evacuated from the Ukraine to the Urals).
- Pinto, V. de S. See Bulatov, M.
- Poems of Pushkin*. Transl. Eugene Mark Kayden. Sewanee, Tenn., University of the South. 24 pp. \$1.00.
- Pruszynski, Xavier. *Russian Year: The Notebook of an Amateur Diplomat*. New York, Roy. 189 pp. \$2.50.
- Reynolds, Quentin. *The Curtain Rises*. New York, Random House. 353 pp. \$2.75. (Contains chapters on Russia at war).
- Rhodes, Harold W. *Russia—The Coming Power in the Pacific*. Wellington, New Zealand, Progressive Publishing Society. 91 pp. 4s. 6d.
- Russians Tell the Story: Sketches of the War on the Soviet-German Front from "Soviet War News."* London, Hutchinson. 146 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Salaman, E. P. See Cornford, F. D.
- Scandrett, Richard B. and Williams, A. R. (eds.) *American-Russian Frontiers: An Approach to Common Understanding*. New York, Survey Associates. 96 pp. \$0.50. (Calling America Series No. 9.)
- Schwarz, Solomon M. See Bienstock, Gregory.
- Science in Soviet Russia*. Lancaster, Pa., Jacques Cattell Press. 97 pp. \$1.50. (Papers presented at the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship).
- Segal, Louis. *Russia: a Concise History*. Ill. by Bernard Watkins. London, Allen. 262 pp. 8s. 6d.
- Semushkin, T. *Children of the Soviet Arctic*. London, Hutchinson. 256 pp. 12s. 6d.
- Semyonov, Yuri. *The Conquest of Siberia: An Epic of Human Passions*. Transl. from German by E. W. Dickes. London, Routledge. 356 pp. 21s.
- A Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. London, Central Books. 363 pp. 4s. 6d.
- Skomorovsky, Boris, and Morris, E. G. *The Siege of Leningrad: The Saga of the Greatest Siege of All Time as Told by the Letters, Documents and Stories of the Brave People Who Withstood It*. New York, Dutton. 196 pp. \$2.50.
- Snow, Edgar. *People on Our Side*. New York, Random House. 324 pp. \$3.50. (Includes a part on Soviet Russia).
- Solovyev, Vladimir. See Zouboff, Peter P.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. *Russia and the United States*. New York, Dutton. 253 pp. \$3.00.
- Soviet War Stories by Mikhail Sholokhov and Others*. London, Hutchinson, 192 pp. 9s. 6d.
- Stowe, Leland. *They Shall Not Sleep*. New York, Knopf. 399 pp. \$3.00. (Includes account of author's 1942 trip to U.S.S.R.).

- Strakhovsky, Leonid I. *Intervention at Archangel: The Story of Allied Intervention and Russian Counter-Revolution in North Russia, 1918-1920*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press. 336 pp. \$3.00.
- Strong, Anna Louise. *Peoples of the U.S.S.R.* New York, Macmillan. 246 pp. \$2.50.
- Stronger Than Death: Stories of the Russians at War*. San Francisco, American-Russian Institute. 82 pp. No price. (Ten short stories by Soviet writers.)
- Struve, Gleb. *Twenty-Five Years of Soviet Literature (1918-1943)*. London, Routledge. 347 pp. 15s. (Rev. ed. of *Soviet Russian Literature*, 1935).
- Swenson, Olaf. *Northwest of the World*. New York, Dodd, Mead. 270 pp. \$3.00. (Forty years of life in Northern Siberia.)
- Tolstoy, Alexei. *My Country: Articles and Stories of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*. Transl. D. L. Fromberg. London, Hutchinson. 117 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Treviranus, G. R. *Revolutions in Russia: Their Lessons for the Western World*. New York, Harper. 303 pp. \$3.00.
- Trotsky, Leon. *The New Course*. Transl. Max Schachtman. New York, The New International Publishing Company. 265 pp. \$2.00.
- The Truth About Religion in Russia*. London, Hutchinson. 175 pp. 16s.
- Turin, S. P. *The U.S.S.R.: An Economic and Social Survey*. London, Methuen. 219 pp. 16s.
- Vernadsky, George. *A History of Russia*. Rev. ed. New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press. 517 pp. \$2.75. (Popular edition: New York, Garden City, New Home Library. \$0.69.)
- Vladimir Lenin: A Political Biography*. Prepared by Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute. New York, International Publishers. 288 pp. \$2.50.
- Ward, Harry F. *The Soviet Spirit*. New York, International Publishers. 160 pp. \$1.75.
- Wasilewska, Wanda. *The Rainbow*. Transl. from the Polish by Edith Bone. New York, Simon and Schuster. 230 pp. \$2.50 (Resistance to the German invaders in the Ukraine).
- Werth, Alexander. *Leningrad*. New York, Knopf. 189 pp. \$2.50.
- The Western Frontier of Russia*. New York, Willard Publishing Co. (Published for the Association of Officers and Men, formerly of the Russian Army.) 60 pp. \$0.25.
- Weyers, J. *Poland and Russia*. Foreword by Guy Lloyd. London, Barnard and Westwood. 64 pp. 2s. 6d.
- White, D. Fedotoff. *The Growth of the Red Army*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press. 486 pp. \$3.75.
- White, William C. *Made in the U.S.S.R.* New York, Knopf. 159 pp. \$2.00.
- Whitfield, Francis J. *A Russian Reference Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press. 222 pp. \$2.50.

- Williams, A. R. *See* Scandrett, Richard B.
- Yarmolinsky, Avraham (ed.) *A Treasury of Great Russian Short Stories*. New York, Macmillan. 1918 pp. \$4.00.
- Yugow, Aaron. *See* Bienstock, Gregory.
- Zernov, Nicholas. *Three Russian Prophets: Khomiakov, Dostoevsky, Soloviev*. London, Student Christian Movement Press. 171 pp. 8s. 6d.
- Zouboff, Peter P. *Vladimir Solovyev on Godmanhood* (with a translation of Solovyev's *Lectures on Godmanhood*). New York, International University Press. 233 pp. \$3.75.

II ARTICLES*

- Avanesov, Reuben. "Problems of Dialectology in the Soviet Union." *Modern Language Review*, XXXIX: 167-171.
- Avinoff, A. "Russian Icons: an Exhibition of the Hann Collections." *Carnegie Magazine*, XVII: 227-235.
- "Ballet in Wartime Russia." *Dance Magazine*, April, 1944.
- Beals, Carleton. "The Soviet Wooing of Latin America." *Harper's Magazine*, CLXXXIX: 210-218.
- Beazley, Raymond. "Early Russian Embassies and Treaties in Asia." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVI: 32-37.
- "Some Aspects of Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy." *The Quarterly Review*, CCLXXXII: 562: 460-474.
- Beneš, Eduard. "The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 5: 22ff.
- Ben-Horin, Eliahu. "The Soviet Wooing of Palestine: Russian-British Competition in the Middle East." *Harper's Magazine*, CLXXXVIII: 413-418.
- Berholtz, Olga. "Frontline Librarians: a Leningrad Epic." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 1: 20-31.
- Bertensson, S. "Tchaikovsky Museum at Klin." *Musical Quarterly*, XXX: 329-335.
- Birkett, G. A. "The Making of Russia." *Geographical Magazine*, XVII: 193-205.
- Blumenfeld, Hans. "Municipal Reconstruction." *Soviet Culture in Wartime*, No. 2, 1944.
- "Soviet City Planning: an Example." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 1: 53-65.
- Brusher, J. S. "The Bear at the Conference Table." *Catholic World*, CLVIII: 465-469.

*The articles published in *The Russian Review* in 1944 are not listed here; they appear in the Index to Volumes III and IV in the present issue of the Review [Ed.].

- Brutzkus, J. "The Khazar Origin of Ancient Kiev." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 58: 108-124.
- Carter, Edward C. "Russia's Future Role." *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, XXI: 24-28.
- "Our War Relief Goes Through." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 52-55.
- "Russian War Relief." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 61-74.
- "Soviet Russia's Contribution to Peace." *Annals of the American Academy, of Political and Social Science*. CCXXXIV: 47-53.
- Casey, R. P. "Russian Religion Today: A Review of the Truth about Religion in Russia." *Review of Religion*, VIII: 370-383.
- Chamberlin, W. H. "Can Stalin's Russia Go Democratic?" *American Mercury*, LVIII: 142-148.
- "Information Please about Russia." *Harper's Magazine*, CLXXXVIII: 405-412.
- "Russia, Vast Land of Riches." *Science Digest*, XV: 21-24.
- "Will Stalin Dictate an Eastern Munich?" *American Mercury*, LVIII: 263-274.
- Chen, J. "Graphic Arts in the U.S.S.R." *London Studio*, XXVII: 34-42.
- Conant, Kenneth J. "Novgorod, Constantinople, and Kiev in Old Russian Church Architecture." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 75-92.
- Cross, Samuel H. "American-Soviet Relations." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII No. 58: 16-27.
- "On Teaching Contemporary Russian Civilization." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 93-101.
- Dallin, David J. "Russia's Plan for Germany." *American Mercury*, LVIV: 440-447.
- Dean, Vera Micheles. "The United States and the Soviet Union." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 126ff.
- Deutscher, I. "Reflections on the Russian Problem." *Political Quarterly*, XV: 77-84.
- De Voto, Bernard. "Easy Chair: Russia and America." *Harper's Magazine*, CLXXXIX: 426-429.
- Dobb, Maurice. "Social Insurance in the Soviet Union." *Soviet Russia Today*, XII: 9: 10ff.
- Dreiser, Theodore. "The Russian Advance." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 3: 9ff.
- Duchaček, Ivo. "Transformation of the Soviet Union." *Central European Observer*, XXI: 49-50.
- Drew, Charles R. "The Role of Soviet Investigators in the Development of the Blood Bank." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 360-369.
- Dupont, Pierre. "Five Men Are to Rebuild Russia." *Free World*, VII: 249-252.
- Duranty, Walter. "Our Ally—Soviet Russia." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 117-119.
- Eckel, Paul E. "The Crimean War and Japan." *The Far-Eastern Quarterly*, III: 2: 109-118.
- Eden, C. "Trade with Russia." *National Review*, CXXIII: 223-226.
- Ehrenburg, Ilya. "Justice—Not Vengeance." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 8: 9-10.

Bibliography

- Engel, Leonard. "The Red Navy." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 1: 16-17.
- Erskine, Dorothy, and Roberts, Holland. "What 36,000,000 Children Are Learning." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 100ff.
- Eulau, H. H. F. "New Soviet Nationalism." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXXXII: 25-32.
- Fairchild, Mildred. "Social-Economic Classes in Soviet Russia." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 236-241.
- Fay, Sidney B. "The Magnificent Red Army." *Current History*, VI: 296-303.
- "Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran." *Current History*, VI: 97-103.
- "Russo-Polish Dispute." *Current History*, VI: 193-200.
- "Russo-Finnish Relations: No Satisfactory Armistice Terms Have Yet Been Reached." *Current History*, VI: 385-390.
- Feffer, Itzik. "Soviet Jews Fight." *New Currents*, August, 1944.
- Fischer, A. J. "Turkey and the Soviet Union." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVI: 152-157.
- Fischer, Louis. "Under the Soviet Rainbow." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 95, 98ff.
- Fisher, Harold H. "Stumbling Blocks and Stepping Stones." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 123ff.
- Flamm, I. H. "A Practical View of the Soviets." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 4: 12-13.
- Folsom, Joseph K., and Strelsky, Nikander. "Russian Values and Character—a Preliminary Exploration." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 276-307.
- Fox, G. "Constitutional Changes in the U.S.S.R." *Labour Monthly*, XXVI: 87-90.
- Frei, Bruno. "The Young Red Army Generals." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 9-10.
- Gannett, Lewis. "The Cavalcade of Interpreters." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 48-51.
- Georgevski, A., Krichevski, Y., and Gorski, B. "Medical Organization for a Military Offensive." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 5: 389-399.
- Gillis, J. M. "Getting Wise to Russia." *Catholic World*, CLX: 1-6.
- "Russia Trips the Applecart." *Catholic World*, CLVIII: 513-520.
- Gilmore, Eddy. "The Liberated Ukraine." *National Geographic Magazine*, LXXXV: 513-536.
- Glasgow, G. "Russia in Victory." *Contemporary Review*, CLXV: 309-312.
- Gloyn, C. K. "Christianity and the Influence of the Soviet Union." *Christendom*, IX: 2: 153-171.
- Grossman, Vasili. "Life." (Short Story): *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 4: 24ff.
- Gruber, Ruth. "Neighbors across the Arctic." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 2: 83-88ff.
- Guerard, Albert. "Frontiers of the Soviet World." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XX: 251-262.

- Gwynn, C. "Sevastopol and After." *The Fortnightly*, CLV: 371-377.
- Halpern, Dorothy A. "Anatol A. Smorodintsev." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 4: 371-373. (Decorated for service in conquering encephalitis.)
- "Sergei S. Yudin." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 3: 267-269. (Soviet surgeon.)
- "Valentine D. Soloviev." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 5: 461-464. (Research director, Central Institute of Microbiology and Epidemiology.)
- Harrington, J. P. "New Method of Transliterating Russian." *Washington Academy of Science Journal*, XXXIV: 108-110.
- Hazard, John N. "Law, the Individual and Property in the U.S.S.R." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 250-256.
- Hindus, Maurice. "Youth and Its Skylines." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 2: 102-104.
- Hoover, Calvin B. "Capitalism and Socialism: a New Soviet Approach." *Foreign Affairs*, XXII: 232-242.
- Hromadka, J. L. "Russia and the West." *The Fortnightly*, CLV: 34-41.
- Hula, E. "Nationalities Policy of the Soviet Union; Theory and Practice." *Social Research*, XI: 168-201.
- Ickes, Harold L. "What Russia Contributed." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 3: 8ff.
- Inber, Vera. "Besieged Leningrad." Transl. A. Kaun and D. P. Radin. *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 2: 94. (Poem.)
- Isaacs, Edith J. R., and Rosamond Gilder. "Russian Theatre Comes in Waves." *Theatre Arts*, XXVIII: 476-486.
- Iswolsky, Helen. "Spiritual Resurgence in Russia." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 2: 112-115.
- Jacques, Agnes. "New Problems in the Teaching of Russian." *Modern Language Journal*, XXVIII: 159-162.
- Joesten, Joachim. "Ways of the Kremlin." *Canadian Forum*, XXIV: 104-106.
- Johnston, Eric. "A Business View of Russia." *Nation's Business*, 21-22.
- "To Bridge the Gulf Between the U. S. and Russia." Talk to Russia, Moscow, June 3, 1944. *Reader's Digest*, XL: 33-6.
- Karpovich, Michael. "Forerunner of Lenin: P. N. Tkachev." *Review of Politics*, VI: 336-350.
- Kaun, Alexander. "Cannons Have Not Silenced the Muses." *Survey Graphic*, XXXII: 2: 90-93ff.
- "English Literature for Russian Readers." *Books Abroad*, XVIII: 138.
- "The Russian Church and the War." *Books Abroad*, XVIII: 19-22.
- Kazakevich, Vladimir D. "Social Sciences in the Soviet Union." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 3: 312-318.
- Keeton, G. W. "The U.S.S.R. and the Far East." *London Quarterly of World Affairs*, IX: 127-132.
- King, Beatrice. "New Trends in Soviet Education." *Soviet Culture in Wartime*, No. 2, 1944.

- Kingsbury, John A. "Soviet Health Lines Ahead." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 2: 110-111ff.
- Kirchner, Walther. "A Milestone in European History: the Danish-Russian Treaty of 1562." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 39-48.
- Knyazhnin, Y. B. "The Ill-Fated Coach." Transl. Jeannette Eyre, *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 58: 125-137.
- Kolarz, Walter J. "U.S.S.R.: Empire or Commonwealth?" *The Fortnightly*, CLVI: 179-186.
- Kolomeitzoff . . . "Tank Wedges." Transl. N. Corotneff, *Infantry Journal*, LV: 48-49.
- Korostovetz, Vladimir de. "Kiev." *Contemporary Review*, CLXVI: 233-237.
- Kridl, Manfred. "Russian Formalism." *The American Bookman*, I: 1: 19-30.
- Krinitzky, Boris. "The Rebuilding of Stalingrad." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 2: 14-15.
- Kucharzewski, Jan. "German Philosophy and the Russian Intelligentsia." *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*. II: 1057-1076.
- Kulischer, Eugene. "Recent Migration in the Soviet Union." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 223-228.
- Kuznetsov, G. "Russia's Plans for Rebuilding." *Architectural Record*, XCVI: 96ff.
- Lamont, Corliss. "American Names on Soviet Maps." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 5: 14-15.
- "The Five New Republics: a Survey of the Karelo-Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, and Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republics." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 8: 14-15.
- "Peoples of the Soviet Union." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 2: 16-17ff.
- Lancaster, William W. "Post War Trade and a Rule of Thumb." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 120-121.
- Landauer, C. "From Marx to Menger: Recent Developments of Soviet Economics." *American Economic Review*, XXXIV: 340-344.
- Lattimore, Owen. "A Soviet Analysis of Chinese Civilization." *Pacific Affairs*, XVII: 81-89.
- Lednicki, Waclaw. "Bloks Polish Poem: A Literary Episode in the History of Russian-Polish Relations." *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, II: 461-500.
- "Russian-Polish Relations." *Dalhousie Review*, VI: 193-200.
- "The Russo-Polish Dispute: The Historical, Cultural, and Political Background." *Review of Politics*, VI: 151-174.
- Leibholtz, G. H. "Ideology in the Post-War Policy of Russia and the Western Powers: The Study of a Contrast." *Hibbert Journal*, XLII: 116-125.
- Leontiev, L. A., and others. "Political Economy in the Soviet Union." *Science and Society*, VIII: 2: 115-125.
- "The Teaching of Economics in the Soviet Union." *American Economic Review*, XXXIV: 3: 501-530; 531-537.

- Levin, Deanna. "Soviet Schools Today." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 1: 22ff.
- Livesay, G. F. B. "Where Will Stalin Stop?" *Dalhousie Review*, XXIII: 409-414.
- Long, F. "Aspects of Truth in Books about Russia." *American Library Association Bulletin*: 102-108.
- Lorimer, Frank. "Recent Population Trends in the Soviet Union." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 219-222.
- MacLeish, Archibald. "A Slavic Center for the Library of Congress." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 1: 11-14.
- Magidoff, Robert. "Book Publishing in Russia." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXIV: 66-69.
- "Old Bottles-New Wine—Modern Folktales." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 99ff. (Translations.)
- Mandel, William. "Democratic Aspects of Soviet Government Today." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 257-266.
- "Soviet Industry at War." *Soviet Russia Today*, XII: 12: 24-25 and XIII: 1: 14-15ff.
- "Soviet Railroads." *Soviet Russia Today*, XII: 9: 17ff.
- "Soviet Transport." *Soviet Russia Today*, XII: 10: 21-22.
- Manning, Clarence A. "The Democratic Trend of Ukrainian Literature." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, I: 40-48.
- "The Double of Dostoevsky." *Modern Language Notes*, LIX: 317-321.
- "Shevchenko and Pushkin's 'To the Slanderers of Russia.'" *Modern Language Notes*, LIX: 495-497.
- Maurer, Rose. "New Soviet Family Laws." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 5: 9-11ff.
- "Recent Trends in the Soviet Family." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 242-249.
- "Those Russian Women." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 109ff.
- Maxwell, William, Jr. "Soviet Rubber." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 4: 14-15ff.
- Mazour, A. G. "Russian-American Company: Private or Government Enterprise?" *Pacific Historical Review*, XIII: 168-173.
- Medynsky, Eugene. "Schools and Education in the U.S.S.R." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 287-295.
- Melish, William H. "Religious Developments in the Soviet Union." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 279-286.
- "Russia and the Four Freedoms." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 2: 20-21.
- Menges, K. H. "Altaic Loanwords in Slavonic." *Language*, XX: 66-72.
- Menken, J. "The Russian Winter Campaign." *National Review*, CXXII: 208-213.
- Meyer, Rowena. "Alexei D. Speransky." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 1: 77-78.
- "V. P. Filatov." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 2: 159-162. (Renowned ophthalmologist.)

- Mikhailchi, D. "Ancient Literature in Russian Translation." *Modern Language Review*, XXXIX: 63.
- Mitrany, David. "The U.S.S.R. and South-Eastern Europe." *International Affairs*, XX: 347-356.
- Molotov, V. M. "Report to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., February 1, 1944. With Text of Soviet Autonomy Decrees." *International Conciliation*, CCCXC-VIII: 234-247.
- Moore, B., Jr. "The Communist Party in the Soviet Union, 1928-1944." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 267-278.
- Moore, Harriet L. "Knowing the Soviet Union." *Booklist*, XL: 244.
- Soviet Far Eastern Relations Since 1941." *Pacific Affairs*, XVII: 294-310.
- "The U.S.S.R. and the Pacific War." *American Review on the Sov. Union*; VI: 1: 46-52.
- "Where East Meets West Again." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 79-81ff.
- Murphy, C. J. V. "The British Look at Russia." *Fortune*, XXXIX: 168-173.
- Nabokov, Nicholas. "Stravinsky Now." *The Partisan Review*, XI: 3: 324-334.
- Nelson, Donald. "American Production and the Russian Front." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 56ff.
- Norton, Theodore E. "John Paul Jones and Suvorov." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 3: 16ff.
- N. T., Chief-Surgeon. "Notes of a Guerrilla Doctor." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 3: 11-13ff.
- "The 1944 Budget Estimates of the U.S.S.R." *International Labor Review*, August 1944.
- Padeva, Vladimir. "My Native Country—Soviet Estonia." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 3: 14-15ff.
- Pantuhoff, Major Oleg, Jr. "Russia Revisited: An Emigrant Returns to His Native Country." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 58: 71-76.
- Pares, Bernard. "Siberia, Russia's Middle West." *Rotarian*, LXIV: 21-24.
- Parry, Albert. "Crimea Will Live Again." *Travel*, LXXXIII: 10-13.
- "Land Whence Stalin Came." *Travel*, LXXXIII: 4-9.
- "Might of the Ukraine." *Travel*, LXXXII: 22-26.
- "Russia's Asiatic Quislings." *Asia*, XLIV: 542-545.
- "Peoples of Soviet Russia—Books and Background." *Library Journal*, LXIX: 399-400.
- Perry, Ralph Barton. "Realities in Eastern Europe." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 11: 8-9.
- Peterson, O. M. "So You're Celebrating Russia Book Week." *American Library Association Bulletin*, XXXVIII: 152-154.
- Pinto, Vivian de Sola. "Russian War Poetry." *Queen's Quarterly*, LI: 245-254.
- Poole, Ernest. "Maxim Gorky in New York." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 58: 77-83.
- Pope, Arthur Upham. "Can Stalin's Russia Go Democratic?" *American Mercury*, LVIII: 135-142.
- "Portrait of a Lady Diplomat." (Mme. Kollontai.) *The American Slav*, April, 1944.

- Pozelyevsky, A. "Linguistics in Soviet Turkmenia." *Modern Language Review*, XXXIX: 4: 392-397.
- Prince, C. "Legal and Economic Factors Affecting Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy." *American Political Science Review*, XXXVIII: 656-669.
- Propper-Grashchenkov, N. I. "The All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine and the War." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 108-118.
- Pruszynski, K. "Soviet Concordat." *Dublin Review*, CCXIV: 21-25.
- "Recent Social Trends in the Soviet Union." Symposium. *American Sociological Review*, IX: 217-318.
- "Recent Soviet Excavations." *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLVIII: 101-104.
- Reddick, DeWitt. "Development of the Press in Nineteenth Century Russia." *Journalism Quarterly*, XXI: 1: 45-54.
- "Rehabilitation of Liberated Areas in the U.S.S.R." *International Labor Review*, June 1944.
- Rogers, Leighton. "Russians Like Our Planes." *Harper's Magazine*, CLXXXIX: 305-314.
- Ropes, Ernest C. "The Shape of United States-Soviet Trade, Past and Future." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 1-15.
- "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a Factor in World Trade." *World Economics*, Oct.-Dec., 69-88.
- Rosenbaum, M. W. "Slavonic Studies in America." *Journal of Higher Education*, XIV: 9-14.
- Rosenthal, Lazar. "Recent Soviet Medical Literature." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, II: 163-172.
- Russell, Bertrand. "The Russian Realities: Only if We Face Them Can We Keep the Peace." *Common Sense*, XII: 351-354.
- "Russia's Foreign Policy." *The Round Table*, No. 136: 318-328.
- Scandrett, Richard B., Jr. "Russia's Western Front." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 62-66ff.
- Scheffer, N. "Symbolism of the Russian Icon." *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, XXV: 77-94.
- Schlesinger, Rudolph. "Federalism in the U.S.S.R." *London Quarterly of World Affairs*, IX: 107-112.
- "The Soviet Commonwealth." *London Quarterly of World Affairs*, IX: 133-136.
- Schuman, Frederick L. "The Baltic Republics: Bridge or Barrier." *Soviet Russia Today*, XII: 10: 17-20ff.
- "Soviet Union and the Future of Europe." *Current History*, VI: 465-472.
- Schwarz, R. P. "The Vatican and the Kremlin." *The Fortnightly*, CLXII: 350-356.
- Shahovskoy, Z. "The Actuality of 'The House of the Dead.'" *Contemporary Review*, CLXVI: 161-164.
- "Russia and Europe." *Contemporary Review*, CLXV: 220-226.
- Shimkin, Michael B. "Medical Education in the Soviet Union." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 5: 465-480.

- Sholokhov, Michael. "Prisoners of War." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 117-121.
- Sigerist, Henry E. "Lina S. Stern." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 6: 557-561. (Eminent physiologist.)
- "Rural Health Services in the Soviet Union." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 3: 270-280.
- Simmons, Ernest J. "American Windows on Russia." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 121-122.
- "Russia and Western Culture." *Queen's Quarterly*, LI: 29-40.
- "Tolstoi's University Years." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 16-36.
- Smith, Terence. "Feodor Dostoevsky: A Troubled Prophet." *Studies*, XXXIII: 131: 387-392.
- Smith, Winifred. "The Worker as Hero." *The American Bookman*, I: 2: 35-42.
- Snow, Edgar. "Red Glory and Brown Bondage." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 1: 9-11.
- "Unyielding Shoulder of the Volga." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 67-69.
- "Why the Soviets Won." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 4: 9-10.
- Stalin, J. V. "Stalin on the 27th Anniversary of the U.S.S.R." *Soviet Russia Today*, XIII: 8: 7ff.
- Stanczyk, Jan. "Central Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R." *New Europe*, Feb., pp. 12-13.
- Steiger, Andrew J. "Current Trends in Soviet Aircraft Production." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 1: 37-45.
- "Soviet Middle East." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 72-75.
- Stephenson, Robert C. "The Spirit of Russian Poetry." *Southwest Review*, XXIX: 2: 252-275.
- Stern, Bernhard J. "Soviet Policy on National Minorities." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 220-235.
- Sternberg, F. "Is Russia a Postwar Rival?" *Science Digest*, XV: 41-44.
- Strelsky, Katherine. "The Romantic Movement: a Selective and Critical Bibliography for 1943: Slavonic Section." *Journal of English Literary History*, II: 1: 27-30.
- Strong, Anna Louise. "Russia Rebuilds." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXIV: 92-96.
- "Soviet Farms Wage War." *Soviet Russia Today*, XII: 11: 12-14ff.
- Sukhov, A. N. "Rehabilitation of the War Wounded in the Soviet Union." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 4: 293-299.
- Taborsky, E. "Russian Imponderables." *The Fortnightly*, CLV: 296-299.
- Telberg, Ina. "Heroes and Villains of Soviet Drama." *American Sociological Review*, IX: 308-311.
- Timasheff, N. S. "The Problem of Russia in Postwar Reconstruction." *Thought*, XIX: 72: 28-40.
- "The Russo-Polish Dispute: a Study in the Theory of Territorial Settlement." *Review of Politics*, VI: 175-192.
- "Vertical Social Mobility in Communist Society." *American Journal of Sociology*, L: 9-21.

- Timofeev, N. N. "Organization of Psychiatric Services in Battle Areas." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 3: 264-265.
- Turnbull, Laura S. "Soviet Union: Economic and Financial Conditions." Selected bibliography of books and articles printed from 1939 to date. *Princeton University Library Bulletin*, No. 5.
- Turner, Ralph E. "American Russian Cultural Relations." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 1: 114.
- Twain, Mark. "The Gorky Incident." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII: 59: 37-38.
- "U.S.S.R.: Abstract of Study from the Jubilee Volume of the Institute of Material Culture of the Academy of Sciences." *American Journal of Archeology*, XLVIII: 101-104.
- Vakar, N. P. "An Experimental Pattern: Soviet Russia a Welding Shop for Nationalities." *Free World*, VII: 118-120.
- Van Kleeck, Mary. "The Soviets and the New Technology." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 105-107.
- Vernadsky, George. "Trends in Soviet Foreign Policy." *Yale Review*, XXXIII: 699-720.
- Vinokur, Grigory. "Russian Linguistics in War Time." *Modern Language Review*, XXXIX: 172-177.
- Voigt, F. A. "Poland: Russian Declaration of January 11th." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXXV: 49-63.
- Wallace, Henry A. "Two Peoples—One Friendship." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 41ff.
- Wells, W. T. "Britain and Russia." *The Fortnightly*, CLV: 158-164.
- Wesson, Maj. Gen. C. M. "Administering Lend-Lease for the Soviets." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 1: 3-10.
- White, William C. "An OWI Outpost in Moscow." *American Review on the Soviet Union*, VI: 1: 15-19.
- White, William L. "Report on the Russians." *Reader's Digest*, XLV: 101-122.
- Williams, Albert Rhys. "Meet the Russian People." *Survey Graphic*, XXXIII: 42-45.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Notes on Russian Literature: Tyutchev." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXIII: 78-80.
- Wood, J. B. "How Russia Goes at a Job." *Nation's Business*, XXXII: 29-30.
- "Russia—Customer and Competitor." *Nation's Business*, March, 28-30.
- Yakhontoff, V. A. "From the East, South, West." *Free World*, VIII: 17-21.
- Yarham, E. R. "Russia's Northern Seaway." *The Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXXV: 803: 40-46.
- Young, George. "Recent Anglo-Russian Relations." *Contemporary Review*, CLXV: 257-262.
- Yudin, Tikhon I. "War Neuroses in the Army and in Civilian Life." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 6: 553-556.
- Zilboorg, Gregory. "Some Aspects of Psychiatry in the U.S.S.R." *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, I: 6: 562-575.

Index to Volumes 3 and 4

(November 1943–April 1945)

(Reviews are entered under the author of the book and under reviewer.)

	Volume	No.	Page
Aldanov, Mark: <i>The Fifth Seal</i> . Rev. by Helen Iswolsky.	3	1	118
—A Russian Commune in Kansas	4	1	30
Alexander I and His League to End Wars. Oliver J. Frederiksen	3	1	10
Alexandrova, Vera: The Revival of Liberated Cities in the Soviet Union	4	2	62
—Russian Emigrés in Western European Literature	3	2	87
Almedingen, Martha: <i>Frossia</i> . Rev. by Helen Iswolsky.	4	1	124
American-Russian Cooperation. William Henry Chamberlin	3	1	3
American-Soviet Trade Relations. E. C. Ropes	3	1	89
Anderson, Paul B.; <i>People, Church and State in Modern Russia</i> . Rev. by N. S. Timasheff	4	1	113
Balakirev, M. O. Zetlin (Translated by Olga Ushakoff).	4	1	67
Bane, Suda Lorena and Lutz, Ralph Haswell: <i>Organization of American Relief in Europe 1918–1919</i> . Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein	4	1	109
Bely, The Memoirs of. Waldemar Gurian	3	1	95
Black, C. E.: <i>The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria</i> . Rev. by A. E. Raubitschek	4	1	118
Bodmer, Frederick: <i>The Loom of Language</i> . Rev. by Peter A. Pertzoff	4	1	120
Bogoslovsky, Boris B.: The Genius of the Russian Language	4	1	18
Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1943. (Bibliography) Nikander and Katherine Strelsky	3	2	119
Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1944. (Bibliography) Nikander and Katherine Strelsky	4	2	104
Brown, James: <i>Russia Fights</i> . Rev. by Michael Florinsky	3	1	106
Cardwell, Ann Su: <i>Poland and Russia; The Last Quarter Century</i> . Rev. by Michael Florinsky	4	2	94
Carr, Robert Spencer: <i>The Bells of Saint Ivan's</i> . Rev. by Helen Iswolsky	4	1	124
Cassidy, Henry: <i>Moscow Dateline, 1941–1943</i> . Rev. by Michael Florinsky	3	1	106
Chamberlin, William Henry: American-Russian Cooperation	3	1	3
—Olga Kaidanova's <i>Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniya v Rossii i S.S.R.</i> (Studies in the History of Public Education in Russia and U.S.S.R., Vol. 1).	4	1	116
—Russia After the War	3	2	3

Index to Volumes III and IV

121

	Volume	No.	Page
—Russia and Europe, 1918–1944.....	4	1	3
—Russian Aims in the Far East.....	4	2	3
—The Russian Enigma. Rev. by D. Fedotoff White.....	3	2	101
—The Ukraine: A Submerged Nation. Rev. by Oliver J. Frederiksen.....	4	2	97
Chevigny, Hector: <i>Lord of Alaska</i> . Rev. by Alexander Tarsaidzé.....	3	2	111
Childs, John and Counts, George: <i>America, Russia and the Communist Party in the Postwar World</i> . Rev. by David J. Dallin.....	3	1	108
Church and State in Russian History. Michael Karpovich.....	3	2	10
Cole, G. D. H.: <i>Europe, Russia and the Future</i> . Rev. by David J. Dallin.....	3	1	108
Coleman, Arthur Prudden: The Teaching of Russian in the United States.....	4	1	83
Colton, E. T.: Stephen Duggan's <i>A Professor at Large</i>	3	2	117
Counts, George and Childs, John: <i>America, Russia and the Communist Party in the Postwar World</i> . Rev. by David J. Dallin.....	3	1	108
Cournos, John (ed.) <i>A Treasury of Russian Life and Humor</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt.....	3	2	112
Culbertson, Ely: Russia and World Security.....	4	1	10
Curie, Eve: <i>Journey Among Warriors</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	3	1	104
Dallin, David J.: G. D. H. Cole's <i>Europe, Russia and the Future</i>	3	1	108
—Inside the Red Army.....	3	1	23
—John Childs' and George Counts' <i>America, Russia and the Communist Party in the Postwar World</i>	3	1	108
—Russia and Postwar Europe. Rev. by Foster Rhea Dulles.....	3	2	100
—Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939–1942. Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein.....	3	1	110
Davies, Raymond and Steiger, Andrew: <i>Soviet Asia: Democracy's First Line of Defence</i> . Rev. by V. Zenzinov.....	3	1	112
Dorosh, Harry: <i>Russian Constitutionalism</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	4	2	88
Duggan, Stephen: <i>A Professor at Large</i> . Rev. by E. T. Colton.....	3	2	117
Dulles, Foster Rhea: David J. Dallin's <i>Russia and Post-war Europe</i>	3	2	100
—Joachim Joesten's <i>What Russia Wants</i>	3	2	100
—The Road to Teheran, 1781–1943. Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	4	1	105
Dunphy, William H.: Peter P. Zouboff's <i>Vladimir Solov'yev on Godmanhood</i> (With a Translation of Solov'yev's Lectures on Godmanhood).....	4	2	101

Index to Volumes III and IV

	Volume	No.	Page
Duranty, Walter: <i>U.S.S.R.</i> Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt.....	4	1	100
Early American Observers of the Russian Revolution, 1917-1921. Dimitri von Mohrenschildt.....	3	1	64
Economic Reconstruction in the Soviet Union. Solomon M. Schwarz.....	4	2	49
Edelman, Maurice: <i>How Russia Prepared: U.S.S.R. Beyond the Urals.</i> Rev. by V. Zenzinov.....	3	1	112
Epstein, Fritz T.: David J. Dallin's <i>Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939-1942</i>	3	1	110
—George Keeton's and Rudolf Schlesinger's <i>Russia and Her Western Neighbors</i>	3	1	110
—John Scott's <i>Duel for Europe: Stalin versus Hitler</i>	3	1	110
—Suda Lorena Bane's and Ralph Haswell Lutz's <i>Organization of American Relief in Europe, 1918-1919</i> ..	4	1	109
Fate of the Baltic Nations, The. Henrikas Rabinavicius.	3	1	34
Federal Organization of the U.S.S.R., The. John N. Hazard.....	3	2	21
Fet, Three Poems by (Translations). Vladimir Nabokov.	3	1	31
Fischer, Markoosha: <i>My Lives in Russia.</i> Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt.....	4	1	100
Fisher, Raymond H.: Mangazeia: A Boom Town of Seventeenth Century Siberia.....	4	1	89
— <i>The Russian Fur Trade, 1550-1700.</i> Rev. by Oleg Maslenikov.....	4	1	112
Florinsky, Michael T.: Ann Su Cardwell's <i>Poland and Russia; The Last Quarter Century</i>	4	2	94
—Henry Cassidy's <i>Moscow Dateline, 1941-1943</i>	3	1	106
—James Brown's <i>Russia Fights</i>	3	1	106
—Maurice Hindus' <i>Mother Russia</i>	3	1	106
Frederiksen, Oliver J.: Alexander I and His League to End Wars.....	3	1	10
—Clarence Manning's <i>Ukrainian Literature</i>	4	2	97
—William Henry Chamberlin's <i>The Ukraine: a Submerged Nation</i>	4	2	97
Genius of the Russian Language, The. Boris B. Bogoslovsky.....	4	1	18
German Invasion and Russian Agriculture. Lazar Volin.	3	1	75
Gordon, Manya: Leonard Hubbard's <i>Soviet Labor and Industry</i>	3	2	101
Graebner, Walter: <i>Round Trip to Russia.</i> Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	3	1	104
Guerney, Bernard (ed.): <i>A Treasury of Russian Literature.</i> Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt.....	3	2	112
Gurian, Waldemar: The Memoirs of Bely.....	3	1	95
Hazard, John N.: The Federal Organization of the U.S.S.R.....	3	2	21
Hindus, Maurice: <i>Mother Russia.</i> Rev. by Michael Florinsky.....	3	1	106

Index to Volumes III and IV

123

	Volume	No.	Page
Hubbard, Leonard: <i>Soviet Labor and Industry</i> . Rev. by Manya Gordon	3	2	103
Huntington, W. Chapin: The Russian Translation Project of the A.C.L.S.	4	2	40
Hyde, Fillmore and Nina V. <i>Russia Then and Always</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich	4	2	88
Hyde, Nina V. and Fillmore: <i>Russia Then and Always</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich	4	2	88
Inside the Red Army. David J. Dallin	3	1	23
Iswolsky, Helen: Mark Aldanov's <i>The Fifth Seal</i>	3	1	118
—Martha Almedingen's <i>Frossia</i>	4	1	124
—Robert Spencer Carr's <i>The Bells of Saint Ivan's</i>	4	1	124
— <i>Soul of Russia</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich	3	2	107
James, James A. <i>The First Scientific Exploration of Russian America</i> . Rev. by Alexander Tarsaidzé	3	2	111
Joesten, Joachim: <i>What Russia Wants</i> . Rev. by Foster Rhea Dulles	3	2	100
Kaidanova, Olga: <i>Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniya v Rossii i S.S.R.</i> (Studies in the History of Public Education in Russia and U.S.S.R., Vol. 1) Rev. by William Henry Chamberlin	4	1	116
Karpovich, Michael: Alice Moats' <i>Blind Date With Mars</i>	3	1	104
—B. H. Sumner's <i>A Short History of Russia</i>	3	2	107
—Bernard Pares' <i>Russia and the Peace</i>	4	1	105
—The Church and State in Russian History	3	2	10
—Eve Curie's <i>Journey Among Warriors</i>	3	1	104
—Foster Rhea Dulles' <i>The Road to Teheran, 1781-1943</i>	4	1	105
—Harry Dorosh's <i>Russian Constitutionalism</i>	4	2	88
—Helen Iswolsky's <i>Soul of Russia</i>	3	2	107
—J. F. Norman's <i>The Spirit of Russian Economics</i>	4	2	88
—Nina V. and Fillmore Hyde's <i>Russia Then and Always</i>	4	2	88
—Pitirim A. Sorokin's <i>Russia and the United States</i>	4	1	105
—Walter Graebner's <i>Round Trip to Russia</i>	3	1	104
Kaun, Alexander and Simmons, Ernest (eds.): <i>Slavic Studies: Sixteen Essays in Honor of George Noyes</i> . Rev. by F. J. Whitfield	3	2	115
Keeton, George and Schlesinger, Rudolf: <i>Russia and Her Western Neighbors</i> . Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein	3	1	110
Kerr, Walter: <i>The Russian Army</i> . Rev. by T. H. Thomas Kornilov, Alexander: <i>Modern Russian History</i> (Rev. ed.) Rev. by Bertram D. Wolfe	3	2	104
Lantzeff, George V.: <i>Siberia in the Seventeenth Century</i> . Rev. by Oleg Maslenikov	4	1	112
Lauterbach, Richard: Wartime Russia and the Communist Party	4	2	77
Lengyel, Emil: <i>Siberia</i> . Rev. by V. Zenzinov	3	1	112
Liberman, Simon: <i>Dela i Lyudi</i> (Events and Men). Rev. by D. Fedotoff White	4	2	96

Index to Volumes III and IV

	Volume	No.	Page
Lourié, Arthur: Herbert Weinstock's <i>Tchaikovsky</i>	4	1	122
—M. O. Zetlin's <i>Pyatero i drugie</i> (The Five and Others)	4	1	122
—V. I. Seroff's <i>Dmitri Shostakovich</i>	4	1	122
Lutz, Ralph Haswell and Bane, Suda Lorena: <i>Organization of American Relief in Europe, 1918-1919</i> . Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein.....	4	1	109
Mandell, William: <i>The Soviet Far East</i> . Rev. by Charles Prince.....	4	1	106
Mangazeia: A Boom Town of Seventeenth Century Siberia. Raymond H. Fisher.....	4	1	89
Manning, Clarence: <i>Ukrainian Literature</i> . Rev. by Oliver J. Frederiksen.....	4	2	97
Maslenikov, Oleg: George V. Lantzeff's <i>Siberia in the Seventeenth Century</i>	4	1	112
—Raymond H. Fisher's <i>The Russian Fur Trade, 1550-1700</i>	4	1	112
Mazour, Anatole G.: Albert Parry's <i>Russian Cavalcade: A Military Record</i>	4	1	114
Moats, Alice: <i>Blind Date With Mars</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	3	1	104
Mohrenschmidt, Dimitri von: A. Yarmolinsky's (ed.) <i>A Treasury of Great Russian Stories</i>	3	2	112
—Alexander Nazaroff's <i>The Land of the Russian People</i>	4	2	92
—Anna Louise Strong's <i>Peoples in the U.S.S.R.</i>	4	2	92
—Bernard Guerney's (ed.) <i>A Treasury of Russian Literature</i>	3	2	112
—Early American Observers of the Russian Revolution, 1917-1921.....	3	1	64
—Ernest J. Simmons' <i>An Outline of Modern Russian Literature</i>	3	1	117
—G. R. Treviranus' <i>Revolutions in Russia</i>	4	1	100
—Ivar Spector's <i>The Golden Age of Russian Literature</i>	3	1	117
—John Cournos' (ed.) <i>A Treasury of Russian Life and Humor</i>	3	2	112
—Markoosha Fischer's <i>My Lives in Russia</i>	4	1	100
—Xavier Pruszynski's <i>Russian Year</i>	4	1	100
—Walter Duranty's <i>U.S.S.R.</i>	4	1	100
—William C. White's <i>Made in the U.S.S.R.</i>	4	2	92
Nabokov, Vladimir: Three Poems by Fet. (Translations)	3	1	31
—Three Stanzas from Pushkin's <i>Eugene Onegin</i> (Translations)	4	2	38
—Four Poems by Tyutchev (Translations)	4	1	45
—Gogol. Rev. by Vera Sandomirsky.....	4	2	99
Nazaroff, Alexander: <i>The Land of the Russian People</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschmidt.....	4	2	92
Newman, Bernard: <i>The New Europe</i> . Rev. by George Waskovich.....	4	1	107
Normano, J. F.: <i>The Spirit of Russian Economics</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	4	2	88

Index to Volumes III and IV

125

	Volume	No.	Page
--	--------	-----	------

Oushakoff, Olga. (Translator) Balakirev, by M. O. Zetlin.....	4	1	67
Pares, Bernard: <i>Russia and the Peace</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	4	1	105
Parry, Albert: Prince Golitsyn: Apostle of the Alle- ghanies.....	4	2	18
— <i>Russian Cavalcade: A Military Record</i> . Rev. by Anatole G. Mazour.....	4	1	114
— <i>Russian Names for American Towns</i>	3	2	30
Pertzoff, Peter A.: Frederick Bodmer's <i>The Loom of Language</i>	4	1	120
Prince, Charles: William Mandell's <i>The Soviet Far East</i> ..	4	1	106
Prince Golitsyn: Apostle of the Alleghanies. Albert Parry.....	4	2	18
Pruszyński, Xavier: <i>Russian Year</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschmidt.....	4	1	100
Pushkin, Three Stanzas from Eugene Onegin (Transla- tions) Vladimir Nabokov.....	4	2	38
Pushkin's Ode to the Old School Tie (With an original translation of Pushkin's Poem, "October 19, 1825"). Eugene Raitch.....	3	2	74
Rabinavicius, Henrikas: The Fate of the Baltic Nations.	3	1	34
Raitch, Eugene: Pushkin's Ode to the Old School Tie (With an original translation of Pushkin's poem, "October 19, 1825").....	3	2	74
Rubitschek, A. E.: C. E. Black's <i>The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria</i>	4	1	118
Ropes, E. C.: American-Soviet Trade Relations.....	3	1	89
Russia After The War. William Henry Chamberlin.....	3	2	3
Russia and Europe, 1918-1944. William Henry Cham- berlin.....	4	1	3
Russia and the Baltic States. Nikolai P. Vakar.....	3	1	45
Russia and World Security. Ely Culbertson.....	4	1	10
Russia Meets the Japanese. Harry Emerson Wildes.....	3	1	55
Russian Commune in Kansas. Mark Aldanov.....	4	1	30
Russian Emigrés in Western European Literature. Vera Alexandrova.....	3	2	87
Russian Folk-Song. Nina Vernadsky.....	3	2	94
Russian Names for American Towns. Albert Parry.....	3	2	30
Russian Press in the United States, The. (Bibliography) David Shub.....	3	1	120
Russian Translation Project of the A.C.L.S., The. W. Chapin Huntington.....	4	2	40
Sandomirsky, Vera: Soviet War Poetry.....	4	1	47
—Vladimir Nabokov's <i>Gogol</i>	4	2	99
Schlesinger, Rudolf and Keeton, George: <i>Russia and Her Western Neighbors</i> . Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein.....	3	1	110
Schwarz, Solomon M.: Economic Reconstruction in the Soviet Union.....	4	2	49

Index to Volumes III and IV

		Volume	No.	Page
Scott, John: <i>Duel for Europe: Stalin versus Hitler</i> . Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein.....	3	1	110	Tim
Seroff, V. I.: <i>Dmitri Shostakovich</i> . Rev. by Arthur Lourié.....	4	1	122	-T
Shub, David: <i>The Russian Press in the United States (Bibliography)</i>	3	1	120	Tols
Simmons, Ernest J.: <i>An Outline of Modern Russian Literature</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschmidt.....	3	1	117	Tre
—Tolstoy's Childhood.....	3	2	44	Tyu
—and Kaun Alexander (eds.) <i>Slavic Studies: Sixteen Es- says in Honor of George Noyes</i> . Rev. by F. J. Whit- field.....	3	2	115	Vak
Sorokin, Pitirim A.: <i>Russia and the United States</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	4	1	105	Vas
Soviet Arctic, The. Vladimir Zenzinov.....	3	2	65	Ver
Soviet School Experiment, The. N. S. Timasheff.....	4	2	72	Ver
Soviet War Poetry. Vera Sandomirsky.....	4	1	47	Vol
Spector, Ivar: <i>The Golden Age of Russian Literature</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschmidt.....	3	1	117	Wa
Steiger, Andrew and Davies, Raymond: <i>Soviet Asia: Democracy's First Line of Defence</i> . Rev. by V. Zenzinov.....	3	1	112	We
Strakhovsky, Leonid I.: <i>Intervention at Archangel. The Story of Allied Intervention and Russian Counter- Revolution in North Russia, 1918-1920</i> . Rev. by T. H. Thomas.....	4	1	110	Wh
Strelsky, Katherine and Nikander: Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1943. Bibliography.....	3	2	119	Wil
—Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1944. Bibliography.....	4	2	104	Wo
Strelsky, Nikander and Katherine: Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1943. Bibliography.....	3	2	119	Yan
—Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1944.....	4	2	104	Zen
Strong, Anna Louise: <i>Peoples in the U.S.S.R.</i> Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschmidt.....	4	2	92	—M
Sumner, B. H.: <i>A Short History of Russia</i> . Rev. by Michael Karpovich.....	3	2	107	—H
Tarsaidzé, Alexander: Hector Chevigny's <i>Lord of Alaska</i> —James A. James' <i>The First Scientific Exploration of Russian America</i>	3	2	111	—T
Teaching of Russian in the United States, The. Arthur Prudden Coleman.....	3	2	111	Zet
Thomas, T. H.: D. Fedotoff White's <i>The Growth of the Red Army</i>	4	1	83	—L
—Leonid I. Strakhovsky's <i>Intervention at Archangel. The Story of Allied Intervention and Russian Counter- Revolution in North Russia, 1918-1920</i>	3	2	104	Zou
—Walter Kerr's <i>The Russian Army</i>	4	1	110	
	3	2	104	

Index to Volumes III and IV

127

Page		Volume	No.	Page
110	Timasheff, N. S.: Paul B. Anderson's <i>People, Church and State in Modern Russia</i>	4	1	113
122	—The Soviet School Experiment	4	2	72
120	Tolstoy's Childhood. Ernest J. Simmons	3	2	44
117	Treviranus, G. R.: <i>Revolutions in Russia</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt	4	1	100
44	Tytchev, Four Poems From (Translations). Vladimir Nabokov	4	1	45
115	Vakar, Nikolai P.: Russia and the Baltic States	3	1	45
105	Vasiliev, A.: George Vernadsky's <i>Ancient Russia</i>	3	2	109
65	Vernadsky, George: <i>Ancient Russia</i> . Rev. by A. Vasiliev	3	2	109
72	Vernadsky, Nina: Russian Folk-Song	3	2	94
47	Volin, Lazar: German Invasion and Russian Agriculture	3	1	75
117	Wartime Russia and the Communist Party. Richard Lauterbach	4	2	77
112	Waskovich, George: Bernard Newman's <i>The New Europe</i>	4	1	107
110	Weinstock, Herbert: <i>Tchaikovsky</i> . Rev. by Arthur Lourié	4	1	122
119	White, D. Fedotoff: <i>The Growth of the Red Army</i> . Rev. by T. H. Thomas	3	2	104
104	—Simon Liberman's <i>Dela i Lyudi</i> (Events and Men)	4	2	96
92	—William Henry Chamberlin's <i>The Russian Enigma</i>	3	2	101
111	White, William C.: <i>Made in the U.S.S.R.</i> Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt	4	2	92
110	Whitfield, F. J.: Alexander Kaun's and Ernest J. Simmons' (eds.) <i>Slavic Studies: Sixteen Essays in Honor of George Noyes</i>	3	2	115
104	Wildes, Harry Emerson: <i>Russia Meets the Japanese</i>	3	1	55
119	Wolfe, Bertram D.: Alexander Kornilov's <i>Modern Russian History</i> . (Rev. ed.)	3	1	115
104	Yarmolinsky, A.: (ed.) <i>A Treasury of Great Russian Stories</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt	3	2	112
92	Zenzinov, Vladimir: Emil Lengyel's <i>Siberia</i>	3	1	112
107	—Maurice Edelman's <i>How Russia Prepared: U.S.S.R. Beyond the Urals</i>	3	1	112
111	—Raymond Davies' and Andrew Steiger's <i>Soviet Asia: Democracy's First Line of Defence</i>	3	1	112
111	—The Soviet Arctic	3	2	65
83	Zetlin, M. O.: Balakirev (Translated by Olga Oushakoff). — <i>Pyatero i drugie</i> (The Five and Others) Rev. by Arthur Lourié	4	1	67
104	Zouboff, Peter P.: <i>Vladimir Solovyev on Godmanhood</i> (With a Translation of Solovyev's Lectures on Godmanhood) Rev. by William H. Dunphy	4	2	101

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE

Russian Summer School

Middlebury, Vermont

June 30—August 16, 1945

Director: Dr. MISCHA H. FAYER

Russian House with living and dining facilities

Evening entertainments and lectures

Outdoor activities

Tuition, Room, Board \$205-250

For The Season

Extensive Courses for Beginners

Intermediate Courses

Advanced Courses in Literature and Civilization

R U S S I A N R E A D E R

Edited by

NIKANDER STRELSKY

Associate Professor of Russian, Vassar College

THIS BOOK includes Russian history; classical and contemporary Russian literature; economic, political, geographic and ethnic aspects of the U.S.S.R. We suggest it for those who have a foundation in the Russian language and are ready to turn to reading materials that are varied, informative and practical.

ABOUT 230 PAGES

READY, SPRING 1945

\$2.50

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Inc.

55 Fifth Avenue

New York 3, N. Y.

Russia from White to Red

The Russia I Believe In

THE MEMOIRS OF SAMUEL N. HARPER, 1902-1941

Edited by Paul V. Harper

Russia through forty years of Tsarism, Revolution, Communism, and war. The personal observations of an American who lived a great part of his life there, who loved and understood Russia and never lost faith in her ultimate greatness.

At all bookstores, June 11, \$3.75

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 5750 Ellis Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.



A RUSSIAN REFERENCE GRAMMAR

The only handbook of its kind in English

A scientifically arranged Russian reference grammar

THE difficulty of the Russian language with its complex inflection system for nouns, pronouns, and adjectives, its verb structure that is radically different from that of any Western language, and its apparently irrational stress accent makes it desirable to give the student a reference grammar which will give him some idea of how each new word performs.

THIS book is precisely such a reference grammar. It explains in detail the inflection and accentuation of nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals, and verbs; includes a concise but valuable appendix on the use of cases, moods, and tenses; and provides a complete index of words discussed in the main body of the text.

SPECIAL attention is paid to the difficulties of English-speaking students in the treatment of the use of the aspects of the Russian verb. The comprehensive word lists under the various inflection and accent classes are based on data gathered from the four-volume Soviet dictionary edited by Ushakov. All students and teachers of the Russian language will find this handbook essential for supplementary reference. The author is a member of the Society of Fellows, Harvard University. \$2.50.

By FRANCIS J. WHITFIELD *Harvard University Press
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts*

AR

nouns,
that of
able to
h new

lection
ides a
rides a

in the
word
on the
the Rus-
author

ress
setts